

Mark's Concerns in the Parables Chapter (Mark 4,1-34)

Mark's account of Jesus' teaching in parables (Mark 4,1-34) is a passage of extraordinary complexity, raising a host of exegetical problems. The passage clearly lies at the end of a long and complex tradition-history. In recent years there has been a tendency to see Mark's own interest in this material reflected in only a small part of the passage (perhaps v. 13, or v. 13b, vv. 21-25, v. 34 or v. 34b: see below). Much of the chapter is often regarded as pre-Markan, and to a certain extent, tangential to Mark's own concerns here if not positively un-Markan (cf. below on vv. 10-13). The aim of this article is to question this tendency and to re-examine the chapter, focussing attention on how Mark may have understood these verses.

Much discussion has taken place about the precise nature and extent of the source(s) which Mark has employed in this chapter⁽¹⁾. Clearly the attempt to determine the precise extent of Mark's source material is of importance in helping to pin-point Mark's own redactional activity and hence to determine Mark's own concerns in this chapter. However, one should be wary of assuming that this approach is the one and only key which will unlock the secrets of Mark's theology. Many do appear to assume that a division of the text into tradition and redaction enables us to concentrate on the redactional elements alone as providing insight into Mark's own concerns; the tradition can then be discarded. Such a division is of course very valuable. Mark's editorial additions and alterations to his tradition must (if they can be identified) constitute a major

⁽¹⁾ Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen 1982); W. MARXSEN, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus", *ZTK* 52 (1955) 255-271; H.-W. KUHN, *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium* (SUNT 8; Göttingen 1971) and many others.

source of evidence for Mark's own ideas. Yet one must also remember that Mark's decision to include a tradition, perhaps unaltered, may be seen in equally positive terms in relation to his theology⁽²⁾.

This applies particularly in the case of the parables themselves which appear in Mark 4. Sometimes, these parables are quietly dismissed as almost irrelevant for determining Mark's thought: they are regarded as pre-Markan, perhaps simply illustrations of the general fact that Jesus taught in parables, but in themselves of minor importance for determining Mark's ideas; for the latter, attention is focused on the context in which Mark places the parables, i.e. vv. 1-2, 10-13, 21-25, 33-34⁽³⁾. However, the fact that Mark has gone to the trouble of including these parables (which now comprise about 2/3rds of this section) makes it inherently unlikely that their actual contents were of only marginal concern to him. It seems more appropriate to assume that, in general terms, Mark agreed with his tradition positively enough to decide to include it.

The situation is perhaps more delicate in the case of sections such as vv. 10-13, 33-34, where it has been argued that Mark has made redactional additions to his source material and has consciously sought to modify his tradition. In such instances, the division of the material into tradition and redaction is indispensable: Mark's redactional activity may imply a measure of disagreement with a tradition which he includes only to modify. Thus a totally "literary" approach to Mark's text, eschewing any attempt to separate tradition from redaction, is inappropriate here. But to go to the other extreme, and to see Mark's views reflected only in the emendations which he introduces into his traditions, is equally one-sided.

With regard to the nature of Mark's sources here, many have claimed that Mark has used a pre-Markan collection of parables here, comprising at least the three parables of the sower, the seed

(2) Cf. S. Brown's comment: "Mark's redactional skill is of too high an order to permit us to assume that he absent-mindedly took over traditional material which contradicted his own theological conceptions". See his "The Secret of the Kingdom of God (Mark 4: 11)", *JBL* 92 (1973) 64.

(3) Such a description is a bit of a caricature, but cf. Kuhn's approach: in the pre-Markan source the parables were used to provide assurance for the community; Mark then uses the source only really to develop his idea of the hardening of the Jews (*Sammlungen*, 222-223).

growing secretly and the mustard seed, as well as the interpretation of the parable of the sower. Kuhn's detailed discussions here have been quite influential⁽⁴⁾. All three parables are "seed" parables, and hence may have been joined by a Stichwort connection. All three are form-critically very similar, with a similar message: they are all "Gleichnisse" recounting everyday occurrences, and all are designed to give comfort and assurance to the readers. The well-known difficulties of v. 33 in relation to v. 10 (cf. the change in audience) and vv. 11-12 (cf. the aim in speaking in parables) suggest that v. 33 is in some tension with its Markan context and hence is pre-Markan; it may thus constitute the ending of a pre-Markan parable collection. The presence of vv. 21-25 breaks what may have been an original connection between the "seed" parables in the collection. Finally, evidence is adduced from the connecting phrases in the chapter: καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in vv. (2).11.21.24, καὶ ἔλεγεν in vv. 26.30, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς in v. 13. The first is typically Markan; the others are non-Markan and may come from the pre-Markan source. This confirms the pre-Markan nature of the parable collection to which Mark adds vv. 11-12 and 21-25 (cf. the καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς)⁽⁵⁾.

Although the results of this analysis may be right, one must register some caveats about some of the argumentation which justifies them. Many would accept that vv. 21-25 represent a secondary, probably Markan, addition (see below) and few would dispute that vv. 33-34 are at least problematic in their present form (see below). But the unanimity of the message of the parables is at least questionable (cf. below on the parable of the sower). Further, the argument based on the connecting phrases, although widely influential, is rather weak. Räisänen has subjected the whole problem to careful scrutiny and has shown how fragile the argument is and how little weight it can really bear⁽⁶⁾. There must be genuine doubt as to whether one can say that καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς and καὶ ἔλεγεν are positively un-Markan⁽⁷⁾. Further, it is not clear that the presence of καὶ

(4) For what follows, see KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 129-136.

(5) For a similar appeal to these connecting phrases, see JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 10-11; MARXSEN, "Erklärung", 258-259 and many others.

(6) H. RÄISÄNEN, *Die Parabeltheorie im Markusevangelium* (Helsinki 1973) 89-109.

(7) Cf. also J. LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology in Mark IV", *L'Evangile selon Marc. Tradition et Rédaction* (ed. M. SABBE) (BETL 34;

ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς itself, which few would deny as Markan⁽⁸⁾, can always be taken as an indicator that the saying(s) which it introduces are added by Mark at this point. The most instructive example is perhaps Mark 2,25.27, where v. 25 is introduced by καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς and v. 27 by καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς. Unless one assumes a priori that καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς always introduces a Markan addition⁽⁹⁾, the evidence here is ambiguous. Many would argue that v. 27 (with or without v. 28) represents the original conclusion to the pericope, and that vv. 25-26 are a secondary addition. Yet it is v. 27 which is introduced by the Markan formula, and v. 25 by the allegedly non-Markan one. Thus the example should warn us against deducing too much from the presence of the formulae themselves⁽¹⁰⁾; we should also perhaps be wary of assuming too readily that Mark was only capable of using one connecting phrase⁽¹¹⁾.

The argument about the extent of the pre-Markan source may however be slightly otiose in the present context. Nobody would deny that Mark is using traditions here. (Mark did not invent the chapter *de novo*!) Few would deny that Mark took over from his tradition the parable of the sower, which in all probability goes back to Jesus. (Whether there are Markan adaptations or not will be discussed below.) Similarly, the interpretation of the parable of the

Leuven 1974) 269-307: in relation to the first, "the historic present after all is too Markan" (280), and in relation to the second, the absence of the αὐτοῖς may be to give what follows a "more proclamatory and fundamental character" (293-294).

(⁸) Though see H. WEDER, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern* (FRLANT 120; Göttingen ³1984) 100.

(⁹) So R. BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford 1968) 16.

(¹⁰) H. Koester has argued that Mark uses καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in *two* ways: (a) to bring together previously unconnected material, and (b) to give special emphasis to a saying already present in the context. (Cited by J. MARCUS, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* [SBLDS 90; Atlanta 1986] 29. Koester's article was unavailable to me.)

(¹¹) Räisänen also points out that the theory based on these phrases assumes that Mark must have reproduced them very precisely from his source, even though they are in substance quite insignificant. This might tell against Kuhn's theory that the pre-Markan source was an oral, not a written, one; it would also imply an exaggerated concern by Mark to reproduce his source material very precisely.

sower, although probably not dominical, is also pre-Markan⁽¹²⁾. The parables of the seed growing secretly and the mustard seed are not Markan creations. The sayings in vv. 21-25 are also pre-Markan (cf. the Q parallels, though the presence of these sayings here may be due to Mark: cf. below). Thus Mark is heavily dependent on source materials. So too the interpretation of the parable of the sower must have been inextricably linked with the parable itself right from the start. It is clearly an important question for the history of the tradition whether the three parables were united in a pre-Markan source, or whether they existed as separate entities and were brought together for the first time by Mark himself⁽¹³⁾. Further, one can discuss whether the alleged pre-Markan source itself had a pre-history (e.g. the three parables may have existed as a *Sammlung* before being expanded by the interpretation of the sower). However, for the purposes of identifying Mark's concerns, such questions are of less importance. If the collecting of the parables is due to Markan redaction (MkR), it could be argued that Mark's decision to include the parables in vv. 26-32 should be seen in more positive terms. But even if the three parables were already united in the pre-Markan tradition, it can still be argued that Mark has decided to include this source material (cf. above).

The question of whether the bringing together of these three parables is Markan or pre-Markan can thus perhaps be left on one side here. However, the division of the material into tradition and redaction becomes rather more important when we consider the context in which these parables are placed in Mark 4.

II. Rahmenverse

There is almost unanimous agreement that vv. 1-2 are due to MkR alone. The verses are full of Markanisms and it appears that any vestige of an introduction in a possible pre-Markan source has been completely overlaid by Mark's rewriting⁽¹⁴⁾.

⁽¹²⁾ JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 76 and many others.

⁽¹³⁾ See Jeremias, Kuhn for the first possibility; Räisänen and Lambrecht for the second.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. J. GNILKA, *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theolo-*

The situation with the end of the section, vv. 33-34, is considerably more complex. Almost every possible variation of division into tradition and redaction has been proposed: e.g.

- (a) vv. 33-34 constitute a pre-Markan unit⁽¹⁵⁾;
- (b) v. 34 is pre-Markan and corrected by v. 33 which is MkR⁽¹⁶⁾;
- (c) v. 33 is pre-Markan and corrected by v. 34 which is MkR (probably the most popular view)⁽¹⁷⁾;
- (d) vv. 33-34a are pre-Markan, corrected by v. 34b which is MkR⁽¹⁸⁾;
- (e) v. 33 is secondarily corrected by v. 34, but both are pre-Markan⁽¹⁹⁾;
- (f) vv. 33-34 constitute a Markan unity⁽²⁰⁾.

It seems hard to deny that there is some tension between these verses. V. 33 appears to say, at first sight, that Jesus used parables as a means of getting his message across to the people. V. 34 appears to imply that parables had to be supplemented by further explanations and these were supplied by Jesus for the disciples alone. V. 34 thus links with vv. 11-12 and hence is regarded by many as secondary to v. 33. It is true that v. 33 can be harmonised with v. 34 by interpreting the phrase *καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν* to mean "in so far as they were able to hear (but without understanding)"⁽²¹⁾. This would then make the two verses consistent, and it may be that v. 33 was taken in this way by the person who joined v. 33 with v. 34 and placed them at the end of this section. However, it must

gie der Synoptikern (SANT 3; München 1961) 57-58; KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 137-139; RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 64; LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology", 272 and others.

⁽¹⁵⁾ So GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 60.

⁽¹⁶⁾ So WEDER, *Gleichnisse*, 100.

⁽¹⁷⁾ So JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 10; MARXSEN, "Erklärung", 263; KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 132-135 and others.

⁽¹⁸⁾ So MARCUS, *Mystery*, 88.

⁽¹⁹⁾ So RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 57-58; cf. too H. J. KLAUCK, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTAbh 13; Münster 1978) 255-256.

⁽²⁰⁾ So LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology", 276; E. SCHWEIZER, "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus", *ZNW* 56 (1965) 4.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 133; KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 255.

be said that it is not the most natural way to read v. 33. Thus the view that v. 34 (or v. 34b) is a secondary modification of v. 33 has much in its favour.

Other attempts to solve the problem of these verses seem less convincing. Weder's proposal, that a Markan v. 33 corrects a pre-Markan v. 34, seems unlikely in view of the order of the verses. One would normally expect a correction to follow the comment which was felt to be troublesome. The rhetorical effect of the passage at present is that v. 34, not v. 33, is the climax, constituting as it does the "last word" on the subject. Lambrecht's attempt to ascribe all to MkR also seems unconvincing. Lambrecht recognises the tension between the verses, but claims that perhaps Mark is correcting himself. However, the model of an over-exuberant writer who gets carried away with himself, and then has to back-track suddenly, seems less plausible than the model of a writer preserving, but modifying, a tradition.

If then v. 34 constitutes some kind of corrective to v. 33, can we say whether this is Mark's work or a pre-Markan tradition? The idea of secret teaching given to the disciples is certainly Markan. The evidence of the vocabulary is perhaps ambiguous. Gnilka points to three Markan hapaxes in v. 34 (χωρίς, ἴδιοι μαθηταί and ἐπιλύειν) as well as the double δέ in this verse, as evidence that v. 34 was pre-Markan⁽²²⁾. In v. 33 the lack of an ἐν with παραβολαῖς may also be un-Markan⁽²³⁾. On the other hand, expressions like ἐλάλει τὸν λόγον (in v. 33) and κατ' ἰδίαν (v. 34) are probably MkR⁽²⁴⁾.

The value of the existence of the hapaxes is disputed by some⁽²⁵⁾, since the words in question may be determined by the context (e.g. ἐπιλύειν) and the ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς may be seen as an expression almost synonymous with κατ' ἰδίαν, thus constituting an example of typically Markan duality. Räisänen argues that the double δέ is a stronger linguistic argument in favour of a pre-Markan origin of v. 34⁽²⁶⁾. Note should however be taken of the recent suggestion of

⁽²²⁾ GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 60.

⁽²³⁾ KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 134, cf. Mark 3,23; 4,2; 12,1.

⁽²⁴⁾ S. BROWN, "Secret", 64-65 and others.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 57; LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology", 274.

⁽²⁶⁾ Though he also points out that such a theory has the same implica-

Marcus that only v. 34b is MkR. Marcus points out that the two $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$'s function differently: the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in v. 34a is copulative whilst the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in v. 34b is adversative. It is thus the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ of v. 34a which is particularly difficult to accept as Markan, since one would expect a $\kappa\alpha\iota$ here from Mark. However, the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in v. 34b, which really does introduce a contrast, can be seen as stemming from Mark's own hand.

The least problematic view seems to be that v. 34b (or v. 34) is the secondary element, modifying and interpreting v. 33. Thus the modified ending to the discourse suggests that parables were used by Jesus as a way of speaking to others, but only the disciples were in the privileged position of receiving further teaching and explanation. Clearly this relates closely to vv. 11-12. Can such an idea be Mark's? Linguistic considerations suggest that this is not impossible. However, a surer answer can only be determined by a consideration of vv. 11-12 to which attention must now be given.

III. Verses 10-13

With vv. 10-13, one reaches the heart of Mark's parable chapter, and some of the most intractable problems. A few aspects of these verses are perhaps less problematic than others. V. 10 appears to contain some un-Markan features, e.g. $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\mu\acute{o}\nu\alpha\varsigma$ (a Markan hapax; Mark usually uses $\kappa\alpha\tau'\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ — 7 times elsewhere) and $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ (Mark usually uses $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\rho}\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$) imply the existence of some pre-Markan tradition here. Further, the slightly overloaded reference to Jesus' audience ("those around him with the 12") suggests that Mark may have added to a source here. The most common view is that Mark has added the reference to the 12⁽²⁷⁾. But whatever the precise division into tradition and redaction may be, it seems plausible to see in v. 10 some vestiges of a transition between the parable of the sower and its interpretation, a transition which must have existed in the pre-Markan tradition. It is probable too that in the

tions with regard to the nature of the pre-Markan tradition, and Mark's use of it, as the connecting phrases considered earlier. See n. 11 above.

(27) RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 66; KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 243 and others, though cf. E. BEST, "Mark's Use of the Twelve", *ZNW* 69 (1978) 17-18.

source, the questioners asked about one parable (sing.); this may then have been changed later to "parables" (plur.) in anticipation of the more general saying in vv. 11-12 about Jesus' teaching in parables⁽²⁸⁾.

V. 13 will also be dealt with fairly cursorily here. V. 13a may continue the source's transition from parable to interpretation, perhaps following on immediately from v. 10. But v. 13b, with its rhetorical question directed against the disciples, seems more akin to Mark's negative presentation of the disciples elsewhere in the gospel, and hence can plausibly be assigned to MkR⁽²⁹⁾. What then of the intervening verses, vv. 11-12?

Undoubtedly vv. 11-12 constitute the most problematic verses in this section. Whatever their precise interpretation, the origin of these verses is disputed. Jeremias' proposal in this respect is well known and has been very influential⁽³⁰⁾. He argued that much of the vocabulary, the syntax and ideas presupposed in these verses are un-Markan and hence pre-Markan: cf. the use of *μυστήριον*, *οἱ ἔξω*, *τὰ πάντα*, *ἐπιστρέφειν* = repent, the antithetic parallelism in v. 11, the divine passives, the fact that Isa 6 is restricted in vv. 11-12 to *οἱ ἔξω* whereas Mark applies it to the disciples as well (cf. Mark 8,17-21), and the fact that the version of Isa 6,9-10 used here appears to reflect the tradition represented in the Aramaic Targum rather than the text of the MT or the LXX.

Jeremias claimed that the saying goes back to an Aramaic Urlogion which may well be dominical. Further, the Aramaic equivalent of *ἐν παραβολαῖς*, *אִלְמַבְּ*, did not necessarily mean "in parables" but rather "in riddles" ("rätselvoll"). The original saying therefore had nothing to do with Jesus' use of parables as such. Moreover, the *ἵνα* in v. 12 was perhaps an abbreviation for *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*, a formula indicating the fulfilment of scripture; also the *μήποτε* corresponded to an Aramaic *אִלְמַבְּ* which meant (as in the Targum) "unless", so that the apparent predestinarian force of the saying was not original. Mark then found this isolated saying, and misled by the phrase *ἐν παραβολαῖς*, inserted it into its present context so that the logion was wrongly applied to the parabolic teaching of Jesus.

⁽²⁸⁾ KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 137 is typical of many.

⁽²⁹⁾ RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 70-71 and others.

⁽³⁰⁾ JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 9-13.

Jeremias' argument about the tradition-history of the saying is something of a brilliant tour de force, but it is not necessarily very helpful in interpreting what the saying may have meant for Mark himself writing in Greek. Jeremias' claim that, essentially, Mark made a mess of things, would probably find few supporters today. Marxsen's comment about Jeremias' theory, that it is "ebenso kurz wie verblüffend"⁽³¹⁾ is often cited with approval. Marxsen seeks to modify Jeremias' theory by arguing that Mark himself was aware that ἐν παραβολαῖς meant "in riddles", and so used the saying here to refer to the hidden nature of the Christian gospel in the present. However, despite the fact that Mark is capable of using παραβολή in a fairly wide-ranging way, it seems unlikely that Mark understood ἐν παραβολαῖς as meaning anything other than a reference to Jesus' use of stories/similes to put across his teaching⁽³²⁾.

Jeremias' theory that vv. 11-12 are pre-Markan has won considerable support, but this still leaves open the question of how Mark understood the saying and whether he agreed with it. One particular feature of Jeremias' argument is noteworthy here, since it has, implicitly or explicitly, exerted some considerable influence on more recent analysis of these verses. Jeremias claimed that the picture of the disciples in vv. 11-12, as the privileged recipients of revelation, contrasts strongly with the picture elsewhere in Mark where the disciples fail to understand and are finally regarded as just as "hardened" as οἱ ἔξω of v. 11 (cf. 4,13; 6,52 and especially 8,17-21).

This claim of an inconsistency between vv. 11-12 and the Unverständnis motif in Mark has been implicitly adopted by many, though with different conclusions drawn from it. For example:

(I) vv. 11-12 were not added here by Mark; they represent the vestige of a pre-Markan source, and their ideas do not agree with Mark's own (cf. Schweizer, Räisänen)⁽³³⁾;

(II) vv. 11-12 were added here by Mark, but they represent the views of Mark's opponents, which Mark corrects and attacks via

⁽³¹⁾ MARXSEN, "Erklärung", 257.

⁽³²⁾ Cf. RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 20; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 103.

⁽³³⁾ SCHWEIZER, "Frage"; RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, passim; also J. W. PRYOR, "Markan Parable Theory", *ExpTim* 83 (1971/72) 242-245; G. HAUF, "Erwägungen zum Ursprung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie Markus 4,11-12", *EvT* 32 (1972) 413-421.

vv. 13.21-25 and the negative picture of the disciples elsewhere in the Gospel (Weeden)⁽³⁴⁾.

(III) the inconsistency shows that vv. 11-12 are not part of the messianic secret: whereas the latter (which includes the motif of the incomprehension of the disciples) is to be associated with Jesus' identity, the "mystery" of 4,11 is to be interpreted otherwise, perhaps as the secret teaching which the disciples receive and which they now hand on to the church (S. Brown)⁽³⁵⁾.

The last of these is perhaps slightly different from the other two and will be considered separately when the question of what the "mystery" of 4,11 consists of for Mark is discussed. The other two views are similar in both regarding vv. 11-12 as essentially un-Markan. Yet both are open to criticism.

A full discussion of Weeden's theories about the role of the disciples in the Markan story cannot be given here. It has been pointed out by others elsewhere that Mark's attitude to the disciples is not one of total opposition, that the disciples do not appear in a wholly negative light (cf. 1,16-20; 3,13-19; 6,7-13), that 14,28 and 16,7 which imply an ultimate restoration of the disciples cannot be lightly dismissed, and hence the theory of an anti-disciple "vendetta" in Mark is highly questionable⁽³⁶⁾.

The problem of whether vv. 11-12 are un-Markan in their outlook is however another matter. Räisänen has set out the case for this in most detail and has claimed that vv. 11-12 are un-Markan, not only in their portrait of the disciples but also in relation to the crowds, the opponents and the parables themselves: elsewhere in Mark, Jesus, far from hiding his meaning from the crowds, goes out of his way to "teach" them (cf. 1,21f.; 2,13; 4,1f.; 6,34 etc.); elsewhere too parables are used by Jesus and are clearly understood by non-disciples (cf. 3,23ff.; 12,1-12, esp. 12,12)⁽³⁷⁾.

⁽³⁴⁾ T. J. WEEDEN, *Mark — Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia 1971) 139-158.

⁽³⁵⁾ S. BROWN, "Secret".

⁽³⁶⁾ See E. BEST, "The Role of the Disciples in Mark", *NTS* 23 (1977) 377-401; R. C. TANNEHILL, "The Disciples in Mark. The Function of a Narrative Role", *JR* 57 (1977) 386-405; N. PETERSEN, "When is the End not the End? Literary Reflections on the Ending of Mark's Narrative", *Int* 34 (1980) 151-166.

⁽³⁷⁾ RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, passim.

A priori one must say that the claim that vv. 11-12.34 (it is generally agreed that v. 34 links with vv. 11-12, though see below) are un-Markan is somewhat implausible from a "literary" point of view. If Mark was opposed to the ideas of vv. 11-12.34 and corrected them by means of v. 13 (and perhaps 21-25), it is rather strange that he left vv. 11-12.34 in his text without any very clear indication that he wished to modify them. Moreover, he left v. 34 as the "last word" to the whole section (cf. the discussion of vv. 33-34 above). It would seem more appropriate, given the rhetorical structure of the present text of Mark, to assume that the verses in question were not totally uncongenial to Mark.

Further, the same observations which tell against Weeden's theory of an anti-disciple vendetta in Mark can be applied equally well to theories which seek to drive a wedge between vv. 11-12 and the role of the disciples elsewhere in the gospel. As Räisänen himself has pointed out (against Weeden), the picture of the disciples elsewhere in Mark is not one of total incomprehension or opposition to Jesus: they respond to Jesus' call, they are chosen by him and at times they obey him⁽³⁸⁾. It is precisely this picture of privilege which is reflected in 4,11-12: the disciples have been given the "mystery".

It is also perhaps too simplistic to say that the disciples are put on a par with οἱ ἄλλοι when one reaches ch. 8, thereby abolishing the distinction between the disciples and the rest⁽³⁹⁾. Several have pointed out that the charges of blindness against the disciples are rather milder than those directed against οἱ ἄλλοι in 4,12. Sayings such as 8,17-21 are phrased as questions and do not exclude the possibility of future repentance in the way that 4,12 explicitly does⁽⁴⁰⁾.

The position of privilege given to the disciples in ch. 4 is thus not in contradiction with what is said in ch. 8.

In fact 4,11f. provides precisely the counter-balance which enables the "blindness" of the disciples to function in a totally different way from the "blindness" of the opponents in Mark's story.

⁽³⁸⁾ RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 122-123.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. SCHWEIZER, "Frage", 6; RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 39-47.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 33-34; KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 254; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 101.

Precisely as the privileged recipients of the "mystery", the disciples occupy a role in the story which enables the Christian reader to identify with them positively⁽⁴¹⁾. But then their subsequent failure becomes all the more poignant, enabling the reader to learn from their shortcomings, whether by way of warning not to fail in the same way, or as providing examples of God's care and concern that overcomes human failing⁽⁴²⁾. Such a picture can only have force if the reader has been able to see the disciples in a positive light initially. There is thus no need to drive a wedge between 4,11-12 and the rest of the gospel; indeed, if one does, much of the literary power of Mark's story is lost.

The reaction of the opponents of Jesus to the parables is also not necessarily in conflict with what is said in 4,11-12. It is true that, elsewhere in the gospel, the opponents do not find the parables unintelligible. For example, in 12,12, the Jewish leaders understand the parable of the wicked husbandmen at one level: they "see" what is intended by the story. Nevertheless, they do not "understand" in the sense of ending their opposition to Jesus. Rather they remain confirmed in their hostility, so that in one sense they are failing to "understand" and remaining "blind". The reaction of the leaders here is fully in line with what is said in 4,11-12: they "see" and "hear" at one level, but they do not reach the level of repentance; hence they do not really "see" or "understand". There is thus no need at all to see a contradiction in Mark's viewpoint between the purpose of parables as set out in 4,11-12 and the result of Jesus' parabolic teaching elsewhere in the gospel⁽⁴³⁾.

The other objection by Räisänen to these verses as Markan concerns the role of the crowds who elsewhere in Mark are regarded quite positively but who appear here to be excluded from the "mystery". However, one must take note of the precise distinction which is drawn in vv. 11-12. There is here an "in group" and an "out group", but the former does not necessarily exclude all the crowds of 4,1-2. The "in group", those to whom v. 11 is addressed, comprises "those around him with the 12". However one splits this up into

⁽⁴¹⁾ See especially TANNEHILL, "Disciples".

⁽⁴²⁾ For the first, see D. J. HAWKIN, "The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Markan Redaction", *JBL* 91 (1972) 491-500; for the second, see BEST, "Role of the Disciples".

⁽⁴³⁾ See too MARCUS, *Mystery*, 103.

tradition and redaction (cf. above), it is still the case that οἱ περὶ αὐτόν is part of the Markan text. Further, 3,31-35 has spoken frequently of crowds being "around" Jesus. It seems difficult to deny that for Mark οἱ περὶ αὐτόν has quite a wide reference⁽⁴⁴⁾. The privileged "in group" is thus not necessarily a small group of inner disciples (be it the 12 or otherwise), but a potentially large group including members of the crowd who have shown at least some positive response to Jesus' teaching by coming and seeking further information (v. 10). The description of the "out group" as οἱ ἔξω is frequently noted as a very strong term, referring to those who are positively outside the religious community in question⁽⁴⁵⁾. In context it would appear to refer to Jesus' opponents. Thus Jesus' positive attitude to the crowd elsewhere in the gospel need not be seen as contradicting what is said in 4,10-13.

This raises the question of how vv. 11-12 then relate to v. 34. For v. 34 seems to imply a sharp separation between the crowds and the disciples, with only the latter being in the "in group" for whom "everything" is interpreted. One possible way out of this apparent dilemma is to see the αὐτοῖς of vv. 33-34a as constituting a rather smaller group than the ὄχλος of vv. 1-2; οἱ ἴδιοι μαθηταί in v. 34 could then be a rather larger group than simply the 12, or a closed inner circle of disciples. In fact it is clear that, although the theme of special instruction given to a chosen few is a firm feature of Mark's gospel, the precise identity of the group of the chosen few can vary. (Sometimes it is the "disciples", cf. 4,34, sometimes the 12, cf. 9,35, sometimes an inner group of four, cf. ch. 13, sometimes an inner group of three, cf. 9,2-8⁽⁴⁶⁾.) Mark's terminology is thus somewhat imprecise in his description of who constitutes the in group and the out group, especially in relation to members of the crowd⁽⁴⁷⁾. The fact of the teaching given to some, but not all, seems to be more important to Mark than the precise identification of who the recipients of the teaching are.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Cf. BEST, "Role of the Disciples", 380; KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 248; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 89-90.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 84-85; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 93.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See G. STRECKER, "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie im Markusevangelium", *SE* 3 (TU 88 [1964]) 92.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. BEST, "Role of the Disciples", 392: "The crowd possesses no unitary role in the gospel".

What though of the substance of vv. 11-12 and 34? Are they saying essentially the same thing? Is the "mystery of the Kingdom of God" of v. 11 to be equated with the interpretation of the parables (which is usually taken as the reference in v. 34b)? Are οἱ ἔξω in the state they are simply because they have not received the ἐπίλυσις of the parables? The analysis given above of the reaction of Jesus' opponents to the parables in Mark would suggest that this cannot be the whole story, since at one level they do understand the parables. I consider first the question of what the μυστήριον of v. 11 is.

The general apocalyptic background of the ideas expressed in vv. 11-12 has often been noted and discussed. So too the Semitic background of the term "mystery", as implying a revelation to be universally revealed at the Eschaton but now revealed to a chosen few, has been well documented⁽⁴⁸⁾. Yet still the precise nature of the "mystery" of Mark 4,11 remains uncertain and disputed. Many argue that it is Christological, whether to be interpreted specifically as the secret of Jesus' identity as "Messiah"/Son of God, or more generally as the claim that with Jesus the Kingdom is breaking into the world⁽⁴⁹⁾. For S. Brown, however, the secret of Jesus' identity is not disclosed to the disciples until ch. 8; hence the perfect tense δέδοται in 4,11, which must refer to an event which is past in relation to 4,11, implies that the secret of 4,11 is not the messianic secret. Rather, it is the secret teaching (e.g. the interpretation of the parables given to the disciples but not to others) given by Jesus. 4,11 is thus to be interpreted via 4,34⁽⁵⁰⁾. For Marcus, the perfect δέδοται implies that the secret has been given in what has gone just before, i.e. in the parable of the sower: what is given there is God's

(48) See variously SCHWEIZER, "Frage", 2; GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 155; MARCUS, *Mystery*, and his earlier article "Mark 4: 10-12 and Marcan Epistemology", *JBL* 103 (1984) 557-574; G. BORNKAMM, art. μυστήριον, *TWNT* IV, esp. 820-825; R. BROWN, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (Philadelphia 1968).

(49) For the first, cf. W. WREDE, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen 1901) 58-59; for the second, GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 44. Gnilka himself sees no distinction between his own view and that of Wrede (and indeed refers to Wrede approvingly). However, it may be worthwhile to distinguish between a very precise interpretation (such as Wrede's) and a rather looser interpretation.

(50) S. BROWN, "Secret".

mysterious plan of dividing the world into those who are saved and those who are not⁽⁵¹⁾.

Brown's argument about the relative position in the gospel of the logion in 4,11 can however be brought against his own suggestion. For just as 4,11 precedes 8,29 in Mark, so too it precedes 4,14-20⁽⁵²⁾. If the narrative arrangement of Mark is held to exclude the Christological interpretation of 4,11, it must also exclude the "didactic" interpretation of Brown.

Marcus' attempt to take seriously the perfect tense of δέδοται is also not easy to accept. He interprets the δέδοται as meaning "the mystery of the Kingdom of God has been given *in the parables*"⁽⁵³⁾. But this is very hard to correlate with the clear antithetical structure of v. 11 and the public nature of the teaching in vv. 3-8. V. 11b implies that for some, all is ἐν παραβολαῖς and this contrasts with the claim that the "mystery" has been given to "you". The clear implication is that the secret has not been given to some; but the parable of vv. 3-8 has been given to all. Marcus' interpretation thus seems to founder on the structure of the wording of v. 11 itself.

Majority opinion today is undoubtedly in favour of the view that the "secret" of 4,11 is, in some sense at least, Christological⁽⁵⁴⁾. This may also be indicated by a consideration of how the opponents respond to the "parables" of Jesus in Mark. In 3,23ff. and 12,1ff., Jesus uses "parables", and in each case the context is one of opposition. Further, the reference is in each case Christological (at least in general terms) for Mark. In ch. 3 the opponents refuse to accept that the binding of Satan, and the plundering of his kingdom, is actually taking place here and now in Jesus' exorcisms. Similarly in

⁽⁵¹⁾ MARCUS, *Mystery*, 44-45.

⁽⁵²⁾ RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 61-62, also sees this problem but is prepared to concede a slight incongruity in the Markan time-scale here, although accepting a firm connection between the giving of the mystery in vv. 11-12 and the giving of the interpretation of parables in vv. 14-20.34.

⁽⁵³⁾ *Mystery*, 44 (his italics).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ E.g. M. HORSTMANN, *Studien zur markinischen Christologie. Mk 8,27-9,13 als Zugang zum Christusbild des zweiten Evangeliums* (NTAbh 6; Münster 1969) 118, refers to the connection between 4,33f. and 8,32 in the common reference to "speaking the word", and the clear reference in ch. 8 which this has to the suffering of the Son of Man. GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 34-36, arrives at a similar conclusion by considering the object of the disciples' misunderstanding.

ch. 12, the Jewish leaders react with renewed hostility to the charge implied in the parable that they are frustrating, and ultimately killing, Jesus Son of God. In these parables, the opponents are confronted by the implicit claim of Jesus to be the Son of God, inaugurating the Kingdom of God. Their negative reaction shows them to be indeed "outside", seeing at one level, but at another level blind and refusing to end their hostility to Jesus. It is thus hard to deny that the "mystery" which the disciples have been given is to be closely correlated with the claim that Jesus is inaugurating the Kingdom of God⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Yet one should also note the possibility that the disciples do not yet fully understand this mystery⁽⁵⁶⁾. Elsewhere it is clear that a "mystery" can involve something that is in itself unintelligible and needs further revelation to be understood (cf. Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dan 2). One must not necessarily read the γνῶναι of Matthew and Luke into the text of Mark here⁽⁵⁷⁾. There is thus no necessary contradiction between the picture of the disciples as having been given the mystery in 4,11 and yet not fully understanding its full significance until 8,29, or indeed later. 8,33 makes it clear that however much Peter has said the right words in 8,29⁽⁵⁸⁾, he does not yet grasp the full implications of all that those words mean for Mark's Jesus. Hence he is perhaps in an intermediate stage of "seeing". Like the man in 8,22-26 he only "sees" dimly and in a confused way at first. Full "sight", i.e. insight into the full meaning of

(55) Cf. BORNKAMM, μυστήριον, 825; GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 44; KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 248 and many others.

(56) See MARCUS, *Mystery*, 45.

(57) As is done, for example, by S. BROWN, "Secret", 66. The minor agreement is often discussed. MARCUS, *Mystery*, 86-87, following Fusco, argues that Matthew and Luke may preserve the original text here and that Mark's differences are due to MkR: hence Mark deliberately omitted the γνῶναι to serve his picture of the general failure of the disciples to understand. (Cf. V. FUSCO, "L'accord mineur Mt 13,11a/Lk 8,10a contre Mc 4,11a", in *LOGIA. Les Paroles de Jésus — The Sayings of Jesus* [ed. J. DEL-OBEL] [BETL 59; Leuven 1982] 355-361.) This must however be very speculative.

(58) The literary structure of the pericope in 8,27-29 demands that Peter's confession is viewed positively by Mark: cf. M. D. HOOKER, *The Message of Mark* (London 1983) 54.

Jesus' identity, can only come at the cross (cf. 15,39) and the resurrection (cf. 16,7)⁽⁵⁹⁾.

Brown may well be right to oppose the view that the "mystery" of 4,11 is the full knowledge of who Jesus is. This does indeed come later in the story. But the presuppositions of such knowledge have already been given. In a sense one can almost identify the "mystery" with Jesus himself (as indeed is done in several NT passages, cf. 1 Cor 2,1; Col 1,26; 1 Tim 3,16), so that the fact that the "mystery" has been given is related to the invitation to the disciples to be "with Jesus"⁽⁶⁰⁾.

The mystery given to the disciples in 4,11 is thus not to be equated *tout court* with the interpretation of the parables which is given in 4,14-20. As Gnllka points out, those "outside" are not in the position they are simply because they are denied the interpretation of the parables. This is not the contrast which is stated in vv. 11-12⁽⁶¹⁾. Those "outside" do not "see", one could almost say, simply because they are not chosen by Jesus.

What then of v. 34b where, according to the usual exegesis, the division between the "in group" and the "out group" is on the basis of whether or not one receives the interpretation of the parables. The verb in v. 34b, ἐπιλύειν, is a slightly unusual one in this context. Gnllka has adduced many parallels (from Christian and non-Christian sources) to establish that the verb is used primarily to denote the explanation of something that would otherwise be unintelligible⁽⁶²⁾. What then is the "something" here? It is almost always assumed that it is the parables, and reference is often made to the many instances in Hermas where ἐπιλύειν is used to refer to the interpretation of otherwise unintelligible "parables". However, we have already seen that elsewhere in Mark, the parables are not unintelligible on their own (cf. 12,12). One must conclude that either there is a piece of undigested tradition here (so Räisänen), or one should reconsider v. 34b.

In fact, in v. 34b the object of ἐπέλυεν is not τὰς παραβολὰς but πάντα. It may be that Mark did not intend "parables" (narrowly

⁽⁵⁹⁾ MARCUS, *Mystery*, 145.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Cf. 3,13 and see GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 83.

⁽⁶¹⁾ GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 82-83; BORNKAMM, μυστήριον, 824.

⁽⁶²⁾ GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 63.

understood) to be the object here. Gnllka has shown that ἐπιλύειν can be used in relation to a variety of phenomena, including dreams, questions, riddles etc. But in the apocalyptic world in which vv. 11-12 are clearly at home, a dream can be part of a "mystery" (cf. Dan 2). It may be therefore that for Mark, the πάντα which Jesus "interprets" is the significance of the "mystery" of v. 11. V. 34b then does not necessarily refer to the parable interpretations which are denied to outsiders. For Mark it may refer in a much more general way to the instruction which Jesus gives to his disciples during the pre-Easter period, instructions which as often as not are in secret and not given to all.

The strongly predestinarian outlook of vv. 11-12 has always caused difficulties. It certainly cannot be weakened by interpreting the ἵνα of v. 12 as a ἵνα πληρωθῇ⁽⁶³⁾. Such an understanding of scripture is not really Mark's⁽⁶⁴⁾. Nor can the μήποτε of v. 12 easily be weakened to mean "unless" for Mark. Räisänen rightly criticises Marxsen's attempt to appropriate Jeremias' translation of an alleged Aramaic original to interpret Mark's Greek⁽⁶⁵⁾. Recently Lampe has sought to defend a "weakened" meaning for both the ἵνα and the μήποτε on the basis of the Greek alone. He interprets the ἵνα as exegetical (cf. 9,12; Luke 1,43), and the μήποτε as meaning "perhaps" and introducing an indirect question⁽⁶⁶⁾. Yet although both interpretations are possible in Greek separately (and hence avoid the problems of having to appeal to an alleged Aramaic Ur-form), the combination of both the ἵνα and the μήποτε together does seem to suggest a final meaning⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Mark may simply be reflecting the *de facto* opposition which Jesus, and the later church, have experienced, and then interpreting factual reality as due to divine intention. Further, since Mark is presumably writing primarily for Christian readers, the point of the

⁽⁶³⁾ So JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 13; MARXSEN, "Erklärung", 269; GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 47-48.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Cf. A. SUHL, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh 1965) 145.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 14-15; cf. MARXSEN, "Erklärung", 271.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ P. LAMPE, "Die markinische Deutung des Gleichnisses vom Sämann. Markus 4,10-12", *ZNW* 65 (1974) 140-150.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Cf. RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 15; C. E. CARLSTON, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia 1975) 104.

saying is not necessarily to damn outsiders just for the sake of it. The saying serves quite as much to exhort the Christian readers, to assure them of their own privileged position, to bolster flagging spirits, as well as to warn them of their own responsibilities (cf. below).

This section of the article has not attempted to delineate precisely the pre-Markan tradition in vv. 10-13. All I have attempted to show is that many of the ideas of these verses can be incorporated into a reasonably coherent Markan scheme whereby the disciples (and others) are shown to be uniquely privileged, but where the full implications of their position have yet to come to light.

IV. Verses 21-25

For reasons of space, these verses will be dealt with fairly briefly here. The recent studies of Gnilka, Dupont, Laufen, Lambrecht and others have reached a certain measure of agreement about many facets of these verses⁽⁶⁸⁾. All four sayings have parallels in Q, and the likelihood is that in many respects, it is Mark who has adapted the wording of the sayings to suit the present context. Schneider has shown that in v. 21, the question form, the fact that *λύχνος* is the subject of the verb, and the use of *ἴνα*, are all probably due to MkR⁽⁶⁹⁾. Further, the *ἴνα* clauses in v. 22 are also probably MkR⁽⁷⁰⁾. There are as well many links between the contents of vv. 21-23 and vv. 11-12 (cf. the *ἴνα* clauses, the parallel between the idea of being "hidden" and the "mystery" of v. 11), so that many have suggested very plausibly that the presence of this collection of logia in Mark 4 is due to MkR⁽⁷¹⁾.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ GNILKA, *Verstockung*; LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology", 285-290; R. LAUFEN, *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markus-evangeliums* (BBB 54; Bonn 1980) 165-173; J. DUPONT, *Études sur les Évangiles synoptiques* (BETL 70; Leuven 1985) 259-294.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ G. SCHNEIDER, "Das Bildwort von der Lampe. Zur Traditionsgeschichte eines Jesus-Wortes", *ZNW* 91 (1970) 183-209.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ DUPONT, *Études*, 274; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 135 and others.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Cf. LAUFEN, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 165-166; DUPONT, *Études*, 259-267; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 130 and others.

What function do these verses serve in the whole chapter? A very widely held view would connect vv. 21-23 with vv. 11-12 (cf. above). Thus, vv. 21-22 imply that the secret given to the disciples will be/must be proclaimed openly⁽⁷²⁾. Thus any element of secrecy and hiddenness in v. 11 is now relativised. Carlston comments:

No stress on the Messianic secret . . . should be allowed to obscure the fact that Mark sees the church of his own day as not only competent but obliged to proclaim its understanding of the light that came with Jesus Christ⁽⁷³⁾.

Whether this means that the whole separation implied by vv. 11-12 is now rendered obsolete is not clear. Does Mark envisage the divinely determined division of vv. 11-12 as only a matter of the past, or of the present also⁽⁷⁴⁾? Perhaps one should distinguish various facets. After Easter, the secret of Jesus' identity is an open secret; it can be and should be proclaimed publicly. But the opposition to the gospel is still a phenomenon of the present for the Christian community of Mark's day. It may be therefore that, although Mark realises that public preaching is essential, the mystery whereby some reject the gospel is still a reality and hence the divisions of vv. 11-12 remain.

The fact that, according to vv. 21-23, the "mystery" of the gospel is now to be proclaimed publicly implies that those who hear this message now have real responsibilities. It is this which seems to be reflected in vv. 24-25, where a rather different note is sounded. The introduction in v. 24a stresses the need to "hear" properly. This ties up very closely with the interpretation of the parable of the sower⁽⁷⁵⁾. The measure saying thus provides a warning that those who hear must do so attentively, and v. 25 adds to this warning. Any ideas of divine predestination in vv. 11-12 are thus not to be regarded as excluding human responsibility. Vv. 24-25 thus strike a

(72) LAUFEN, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 168, is probably right to insist that it is wrong to draw a sharp line between an indicative and an imperative idea here.

(73) CARLSTON, *Parables*, 155.

(74) See Wrede, Gnika and Strecker for the first, Marxsen for the second, also K. G. REPLOH, *Markus — Lehrer der Gemeinde* (SBM 9; Stuttgart 1969) 59-71.

(75) LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology", 287; LAUFEN, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 170; DUPONT, *Études*, 265.

paraenetic note⁽⁷⁶⁾. The division between ὑμεῖς and οἱ ἄλλοι is thus not perhaps as rigid as might appear at first sight. This should also alert one to the possibility that this chapter in Mark is not wholly concerned with confirming the status of those who are in the "in group". This does occupy an important part of Mark 4, but it is not the whole story. Embedded here too is an element of paraenesis and warning.

V. The Parables

The same dual note may also appear in the parables themselves which constitute the bulk of this section in Mark. Quite frequently it is asserted that the versions of the parables (including vv. 14-20) are taken over virtually unaltered by Mark⁽⁷⁷⁾. A closer analysis of the parables may cast some doubt on such a negative claim.

Few doubt that the parable of the sower can essentially be traced back to Jesus. Yet this does not mean that secondary alterations have not occurred. In particular, the overloaded description of the seed which falls on the rock looks somewhat suspicious in this respect. The description in vv. 5-6 is very long with a lot of repetition. Crossan has argued that vv. 5b, 6b are secondary expansions of a shorter original⁽⁷⁸⁾, and the resulting "duality" in the text

⁽⁷⁶⁾ GNILKA, *Verstockung*, 40; KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 238-239; LAUFEN, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 170-171; DUPONT, *Études*, 262-263. This is denied by MARCUS, *Mystery*, 156-157, who interprets the division implied in vv. 24-25 along the same lines as vv. 11-12: those who "have" are the addressees, and those who "have not" are the outsiders. But this depends on Marcus' unwillingness to see any element of paraenesis in vv. 14-20 — on this, see below. CARLSTON, *Parables*, 156-157, also refuses to see any paraenesis here, though his argument is somewhat circular: a paraenetic interpretation of the parable of the sower is excluded because vv. 21-25 are said to be not paraenetic; and vv. 24-25 are said to be not paraenetic because the wider Markan context (including vv. 14-20) is not.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Cf. KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 99, 105, 114; WEDER, *Gleichnisse*, 101, 104-105.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ J. D. CROSSAN, "The Seed Parables of Jesus", *JBL* 92 (1973) 245-246. Whether he is right to see here a drastic change in the imagery, from a seed which does not survive the first morning's heat (vv. 5a.6a) to a seed

makes it highly likely that it is Mark who is responsible for the expansion⁽⁷⁹⁾. Moreover, Crossan has plausibly argued that one reason for the expansion is to bring the parable more closely into line with the interpretation: the note about the plant not having a "root" in v. 6 now corresponds to the "root" in v. 17. The effect of this is to provide an element of warning in the parable: Christians are to make sure that their faith is firmly "rooted" so that it can withstand the scorching sun (v. 6), i.e. violent persecution (v. 17). The fact that Mark's community is frequently regarded as being in a situation of persecution, or perhaps better, that Mark wishes to alert his community to the possibility of persecution⁽⁸⁰⁾, would make this warning a thoroughly appropriate one for Mark.

Markan insertions in vv. 14-20 are less easy to identify. Dupont has suggested that the phrase ἡ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον in v. 17 may be a Markan addition, similar to the ἐνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in 8,35 and 10,29⁽⁸¹⁾. The evidence is hard to assess. Some have pointed to the difference between λόγος and εὐαγγέλιον as indicating that 4,17 is pre-Markan⁽⁸²⁾. Others have pointed to the alleged stereotyped coupling of θλίψις and διωγμός⁽⁸³⁾. Yet ἐλάλει . . . τὸν λόγον is probably MkR in 4,33 (cf. above); and θλίψις and διωγμός occur together only twice elsewhere in the NT (Rom 8,35; 2 Thess 1,4). It may be therefore that the phrase in 4,17 is MkR, again bringing out Mark's concern to stress the dangers of possible persecution for his community.

This suggests that, for Mark, the message of the parable of the sower and its interpretation has a clear paraenetic element. Although this has been denied by some⁽⁸⁴⁾, the analysis above suggests that the references to persecution here are important for Mark. The seeds which fail do not simply correspond to οἱ ἕξω, a group which

which grows for a while and then withers (vv. 5b, 6b) seems more doubtful. See MARCUS, *Mystery*, 33, appealing to Calvin.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Cf. F. NEIRYNCK, *Duality in Mark. Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction* (BETL 31; Leuven 1972) 77, 102.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ Cf. HOOKER, *Message*, 116-117.

⁽⁸¹⁾ DUPONT, *Études*, 249; cf. too LAMBRECHT, "Redaction and Theology", 300.

⁽⁸²⁾ RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 73.

⁽⁸³⁾ MARCUS, *Mystery*, 36.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Cf. KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 115-119; CARLSTON, *Parables*, 137-138; MARCUS, *Mystery*, 60-62.

is sharply distinguished from the Christian community⁽⁸⁵⁾. Nor is it necessarily the case that the interpretation of the parable cannot be paraenetic since soils cannot change themselves⁽⁸⁶⁾. The implicit warning here is not to change soils, but to produce fruit⁽⁸⁷⁾. Further, the amount of space devoted to the interpretation of the "bad" soils is inordinately large if all stress is really on the good soil⁽⁸⁸⁾.

Carlston admits that the interpretation of the parable was paraenetic in the pre-Markan tradition, but denies that this is the case for Mark⁽⁸⁹⁾. This however probably drives too much of a wedge between Mark and his tradition: why did Mark bother to include such a paraenetic section if he did not hold with it? (Cf. section 1 above). Mark's views should not be made too monochrome, and there is no reason why Mark cannot be both paraenetic and exhortatory in this relatively long section of his gospel.

The parable of the seed growing secretly presents many problems. Dupont has made a strong case for regarding the present version of the parable as original⁽⁹⁰⁾. It is clear too that, at present, the parable gives a message of assurance. Whether one should see the farmer as representing Jesus or God⁽⁹¹⁾ is perhaps less important. The main message is one of encouragement and assurance to the listeners that, despite the present state of apparent inactivity, the End is assured. Thus Carlston comments: "It [the parable] assures Mark's readers that God is still in control"⁽⁹²⁾.

The parable of the mustard seed is very similar to the parable of the seed growing secretly, though here secondary expansions do seem to have occurred. In particular, the awkward grammar and repetitious nature of vv. 31b-32a in Mark's version are often noted. Many agree that the phrase "smaller than all the seeds" is probably

(85) So MARCUS, *Mystery*, 65-68.

(86) So KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 116.

(87) Cf. KLAUCK, *Allegorie*, 203.

(88) Cf. RÄISÄNEN, *Parabeltheorie*, 74.

(89) CARLSTON, *Parables*, 148.

(90) DUPONT, *Études*, 321-333, arguing against the theories of Kuhn and Crossan.

(91) For the first, see MARCUS, *Mystery*, 177-178; DUPONT, *Études*, 317 (at the level of Mark); for the second, see DUPONT, *Études*, 310-313 (at the level of Jesus).

(92) CARLSTON, *Parables*, 210.

a secondary insertion, and Crossan has shown that the repetition of the clause is typical of Mark's technique when he inserts material⁽⁹³⁾. Hence there is no need to see this insertion as pre-Markan⁽⁹⁴⁾. The resulting duality makes it more likely that the phrase is due to MkR⁽⁹⁵⁾. The effect of the insertion is now to bring out the contrast between the beginning and end of the growth process even more strongly than was the case in the parable already⁽⁹⁶⁾. Thus the insertion underlines the note of assurance and encouragement which the parable implies. Despite the smallness of the start of the process — perhaps in the ministry of Jesus, perhaps in the life of the church⁽⁹⁷⁾ — the end result is assured and will be out of all proportion to the start.

In contrast to the parable of the sower, therefore, Mark ends his parables section with two parables giving hope and encouragement to his community.

Conclusion

This article has attempted to elucidate some of the problems posed by Mark 4,1-34. I have tried to argue that the whole section

⁽⁹³⁾ CROSSAN, "Seed Parables", 256.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Contra KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 100; LAUFEN, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 196 and others.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Cf. NEIRYNCK, *Duality*, 98. It is noteworthy that Dupont has changed his mind on the subject: cf. *Études*, 597, 618-619.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ This seems more likely than Crossan's claim that the point of the insertion is "not so much contrast ... in itself as contrast insofar as this underlines time and growth" ("Seed Parables", 257). Crossan tries to align vv. 31b-32a with vv. 6.17. But there is no need to make Mark's redactional interests too monochrome.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ Mark does indeed talk at two levels (so MARCUS, *Mystery*, passim), so that the smallness of the seed is doubtless intended to refer to both the ministry of Jesus *and* the apparent failure of the church. Whether the end of the story-line is also two-fold — referring to the future eschaton *and* to the present church (so MARCUS, *Mystery*, 213-218) — is perhaps less likely. If the parable is designed to give encouragement to a faint-hearted community, it is presumably because there is no present glorious reality that the parable is thought to be necessary and relevant. Laufen is no doubt right to see the present era of the church included in the purview of the parable (*Doppelüberlieferungen*, 194-197), but it corresponds to the hidden Kingdom, not to the glorious End-time.

can be read as agreeing with Mark's concerns generally, but that these concerns cannot and should not be tied down to one and only one aspect. Mark writes to encourage, to exhort, and to warn his readers, to remind them of the responsibilities that they thereby have, to warn them of the dangers which may attack their faith, but also to assure them of the glorious future which is promised to them in the full Kingdom of God⁽⁹⁸⁾.

Faculty of Theology
University of Manchester
Manchester M13 9PL
England

C. M. TUCKETT

SOMMAIRE

Quelques études récentes ont voulu montrer que Mc 4 sur les paraboles contient plusieurs traditions que l'évangéliste a reprises sans les changer et qui ne vont pas avec ses propres idées. Cette position est ici discutée. L'article montre que la section peut être lue comme allant dans le sens du point de vue de Marc, mais qu'il ne faut pas prendre la pensée de l'évangéliste comme monolithique. Marc écrit pour encourager et avertir ses lecteurs, pour leur rappeler les privilèges dont ils bénéficient et donc les responsabilités qui en découlent.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ A version of this paper was presented at the SNTS seminar on The Gospel of Mark in Göttingen, 1987. Research for the paper was undertaken during a period of study at the University of Marburg, financed by the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, Bonn. I am very grateful to the Stiftung for providing the support for my research, and particularly to my host in Marburg, Prof. D. Lührmann, who kindly read through a draft of this paper, made very helpful suggestions and also showed me the proofs of his forthcoming commentary on Mark.

Codex 1739 in Acts and Its Relationship to Manuscripts 945 and 1891

E. von der Goltz discovered the minuscule manuscript now designated "Codex 1739" at Mount Athos in 1879. He reported on its discovery and made some preliminary judgments about its textual character in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1899⁽¹⁾. The manuscript contains many marginal notes from the writings of Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Eusebius, and Basil. Since nothing is later than Basil, A.D. 329-79, it appears that the ancestor of Codex 1739 was written toward the end of the fourth century. The manuscript itself, however, is dated in the tenth century⁽²⁾. Von der Goltz compared the text of Acts in Codex 1739 with Tischendorf's apparatus, and discovered that it agreed with a certain group of minuscules more than with the major uncials, but that "agreements with the 'Western' text, such as D and E, are not rare"⁽³⁾. H. Von Soden used von der Goltz's collation in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, and classified Codex 1739 as the leading member of his I^{b2} group in Acts. He thus considered it among the "Western" witnesses, but with more Byzantine influence than members of the I^a group⁽⁴⁾. Shortly thereafter, in 1932, Kirsopp Lake included Morton Enslin's collation of Codex 1739 against the *Textus Receptus* in his *Six Collations*⁽⁵⁾. Lake stated that "Codex 1739 may well represent the Origenian-Caesarean text of the (Pauline) epistles more accurately than any manu-

(¹) E. F. VON DER GOLTZ, "Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten bezw. sechsten Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben nach einem Kodex des Athosklosters Lawra", *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1899) 1-116.

(²) VON DER GOLTZ (6-7) thought it should be dated between the tenth and eleventh centuries, more probably in the eleventh. However, Kurt Aland has more recently dated it in the tenth century (*Novum Testamentum Graece*, Twenty-sixth edition, 708).

(³) VON DER GOLTZ, "Eine textkritische Arbeit", 17.

(⁴) H. F. VON SODEN, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Vol. I, Part III (Göttingen 1911) 1711-1714.

(⁵) K. LAKE and S. NEW, *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts* (Cambridge 1932) 141-217.

script in family Θ represents the corresponding text of the gospels" (6). He thought the same should be true of Acts, but admitted that "here the evidence fails". He thus made no positive statement about Codex 1739's textual affinities in Acts (7).

Apart from a few, who, in spite of Lake's admission, referred to Codex 1739 as Caesarean in nature (8), von Soden's characterization of the manuscript as "Western" influenced subsequent textual critics to include it as one of the "Western" witnesses for Acts (9). However, Kurt and Barbara Aland have recently described Codex 1739 in Acts as a second-level Egyptian witness, which was influenced significantly by the Byzantine tradition. Thus in this century the text of Acts in Codex 1739 has been classified as "Western", Caesarean, and Egyptian. This lack of consensus about the textual affinities of Codex 1739 in Acts hinders its use in significant textual critical inquiries. This study is an attempt to present precisely Codex 1739's textual relationships in Acts so that the manuscript may be more usable in subsequent investigations into the history of the text of Acts.

In determining the textual character of Codex 1739, the basic method of Colwell and Tune (10), which has been further developed by Gordon Fee (11), has been used (12). Codex 1739 has been com-

(6) Ibid., 145.

(7) Ibid., 145.

(8) Cf. S. NEW, "The New Chester Beatty Papyrus", *JBL* 51 (1932) 73-74; M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Critique Textuelle, II: La critique rationnelle* (Paris 1935) 420; E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles*, trans. B. Noble, G. Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia 1971) 50.

(9) A. MERK, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (Rome 1957); J. H. GREENLEE, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, (Grand Rapids 1964) 117; B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Corrected edition (New York 1975) XXIX.

(10) E. C. COLWELL and E. W. TUNE, "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-types", *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (ed. J. N. BIRDSALL and R. W. THOMPSON) (New York 1963) 25-32.

(11) G. D. FEE, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships", *NTS* 15 (1967/68) 23-44.

(12) There have been minor adaptations of Fee's methodology to make it appropriate for this study in Acts. These will be clear in the course of the study.

pared with forty other Greek manuscripts (twenty-six relatively complete manuscripts and fourteen fragments) at every point of variance in Acts⁽¹³⁾, where at least two manuscripts agree with each other against the rest. Representatives were chosen for each of the known text types in Acts: P⁷⁴ & A B C 81 for the Egyptian tradition; H L P 049 and the Majority Text (MT)⁽¹⁴⁾ for the Majority text tradition; and D P³⁸ and P⁴¹ for the "Western" text. For this initial quantitative analysis, all the textual trivia, such as orthographical variants, moveable v's and σ's, and minor spelling differences have been omitted. All other textual variations are included. The results are shown in column one below⁽¹⁵⁾:

Chart I

I 1739	II B	III MT	IV D
1891 - 94.7%	κ - 86.3%	105 - 96.0%	P ⁸ - 59.0%
945 - 94.4%	81 - 83.9%	P - 94.6%	P ⁷⁴ - 58.7%
323 - 75.3%	P ⁷⁴ - 83.2%	1245 - 93.7%	E - 57.9%
453 - 74.2%	A - 82.2%	049 - 93.3%	B - 57.8%
81 - 73.8%	1175 - 78.3%	325 - 93.3%	A - 57.8%
181 - 72.6%	P ⁸ - 78.0%	H - 92.8%	81 - 57.5%
33 - 72.3%	P ⁴⁵ - 77.8%	L - 92.7%	33 - 56.7%
P ⁷⁴ - 72.3%	C - 77.3%	1241 - 92.3%	1175 - 56.3%
1175 - 72.2%	33 - 72.5%	1874 - 86.9%	κ - 56.3%
C - 71.3%	453 - 71.7%	383 - 86.4%	C - 56.3%

(continued on next page)

⁽¹³⁾ The original hand of Codex 1739 is not extant for 1,1-2,5. That portion of the manuscript has thus been omitted from the study.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Z. C. HODGES and A. L. FARSTAD, *The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text* (New York 1982).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Codex 1739's percentage of agreement with Codex 1891 that is given in Column I, below, omits chapter twenty-eight, the reason for which is stated on p. 38. Codex 1739's agreements with the fourteen fragments included in the study are as follows:

P ⁸ - 65.1% (28/43)	066 - 85.0% (17/20)
P ²⁹ - 100% (1/1)	076 - 64.3% (9/14)
P ³³ - 71.4% (5/7)	093 - 50.0% (11/22)
P ³⁸ - 31.8% (7/22)	095 - 55.6% (6/11)
P ⁴¹ - 49.0% (24/49)	096 - 58.6% (17/29)
P ⁵⁰ - 55.6% (15/27)	0165 - 55.0% (11/20)
P ⁵³ - 72.7% (8/11)	0175 - 70.0% (14/20)

I 1739	II B	III MT	IV D
A - 71.1%	181 - 71.5%	326 - 84.0%	181 - 55.8%
B - 70.2%	1739 - 70.2%	69 - 82.3%	Ψ - 55.0%
κ - 69.9%	1891 - 68.2%	323 - 81.5%	453 - 55.0%
E - 67.3%	945 - 67.1%	104 - 81.3%	P ⁴⁵ - 54.9%
Ψ - 67.0%	Ψ - 63.7%	88 - 76.1%	326 - 54.3%
104 - 66.3%	E - 62.9%	913 - 76.1%	1739 - 54.2%
88 - 65.7%	88 - 62.6%	Ψ - 71.9%	1891 - 53.5%
P ⁴⁵ - 64.7%	P ⁴¹ - 62.0%	614 - 68.9%	88 - 53.4%
326 - 64.3%	323 - 61.5%	453 - 67.9%	945 - 53.4%
MT - 64.3%	326 - 60.8%	E - 67.4%	323 - 52.9%
69 - 63.7%	104 - 59.5%	1891 - 66.6%	1874 - 52.5%
1874 - 63.5%	P - 59.0%	33 - 66.0%	MT - 52.2%
105 - 63.3%	69 - 59.0%	945 - 65.7%	614 - 52.0%
1241 - 63.3%	1874 - 58.6%	181 - 65.0%	P - 51.9%
913 - 63.0%	MT - 58.0%	1739 - 64.3%	105 - 51.8%
P - 62.5%	D - 57.8%	P ⁸ - 61.0%	H - 51.6%
L - 62.1%	105 - 57.8%	81 - 60.5%	104 - 51.6%
H - 61.7%	1241 - 57.4%	C - 59.2%	L - 51.5%
049 - 61.5%	H - 57.3%	1175 - 59.1%	69 - 51.5%
1241 - 61.4%	L - 56.7%	P ⁴⁵ - 58.3%	913 - 51.1%
383 - 59.6%	049 - 56.6%	B - 58.0%	049 - 50.5%
325 - 58.1%	1245 - 55.9%	P ⁷⁴ - 57.3%	1241 - 50.5%
614 - 57.8%	325 - 55.3%	κ - 57.2%	325 - 50.4%
D - 54.2%	913 - 55.0%	A - 57.2%	1245 - 49.9%
	383 - 53.2%	D - 52.2%	383 - 49.6%
	614 - 51.4%	P ⁴¹ - 44.0%	

Column one demonstrates that von der Goltz's statement (that Codex 1739 agrees with several minuscule manuscripts more than with the major uncials) is correct. Its relationship with Codices 945 and 1891 is remarkable and indicates a familial relationship which will be discussed in more detail later (pp. 39-41).

Following Codices 945 and 1891, the next eleven manuscripts (323-κ), with the lone exception of manuscript 323, agree with Codex Vaticanus 71.5% or more. The next discernable grouping begins with manuscript 88, at 65.7%, and extends through Codex 614 (57.8%). These nine manuscripts (with P⁴⁵ and Codex 614 the only exceptions) agree with the Majority text (Column III) 73.8% or more. Codex Bezae agrees with Codex 1739 only 54.2%.

In regard to Codex Vaticanus (Column II), Codex 1739, at 70.2%, falls immediately below the Egyptian group, and 7.6 percentage points above the first Majority text witness, Codex 88 (62.6%). Codex 1739 agrees with the Majority text (Column III) 64.3%, i.e., 11.8 percentage points below Codex 88, the lowest ranking Majority text witness. In Column III, Codex 1739 ranks among the lesser Egyptian witnesses (Codices 33 and 181), and 3.8 percentage points above Codex 81.

Column IV is unique in that the highest percentage of agreement with Codex Bezae is 59%, and because there is a difference of only 9.4 percentage points between the top manuscript and the bottom manuscript in the column (compare that to the other three columns in which the difference varies from 24.8% to 50.2%). This small range in the percentages of agreement indicates clearly the "maverick" nature of Codex Bezae. In comparison with Codex Bezae, Codex 1739 is located near the middle, below most of the Egyptian witnesses and above most of the Majority text witnesses. Codex Bezae does not, of course, represent a pure "Western" text, if ever such existed. Moreover, many of the readings of the "Western" textual tradition are found in the versions or Church Fathers. Because at least two Greek manuscripts had to agree for a variation to be included in this initial stage of the investigation, the places where Codex Bezae has only versional and/or patristic support have not been included; these will be taken into account later.

The preliminary indication is that Codex 1739 in Acts is not a "good" Egyptian witness, but is significantly closer to that tradition than to either of the other two text-types. However, it has long been recognized that this type of statistical information does not always reveal the true picture of one manuscript's relationship to others. There needs to be some way of refining the data to obtain an even clearer picture of Codex 1739's textual affinities in Acts.

Gordon Fee's revision of Colwell-Tune's method, which consists of "weighing" variants after counting them, has been used to so refine the data⁽¹⁶⁾. Eight sample chapters from Acts were selected

(16) Cited from G. D. FEE, "Toward the Classification of Textual Variation: Colwell and Tune Revisited", a paper presented to the New Testament textual criticism seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature, Washington, D.C., 24-27 October, 1974.

(chapters 2; 8; 10; 14; 15; 18; 20 and 24), and from them the "potentially genetically significant" variations were extracted. "Genetically significant variations" are those textual variants which would seem to be more than scribal errors, and would thus indicate something significant about the relationship of two manuscripts sharing the same reading. According to Fee:

Genetic relationship must ultimately be built on firmer ground than on agreements, for example, in the addition/omission of articles, possessives, conjunctions, or the tense change of verbs, or certain kinds of changes of word order, or, in many instances, of harmonization. On the other hand, major rewritings, some large addition/omission variants, certain kinds of substitutions, as well as several kinds of word order variants, must certainly be recognized as the basic data from which to construct stemmata of textual relationships⁽¹⁷⁾.

The selection process is simply an attempt to base textual relationships on something more substantial than the great mass of textual trivia.

Within the eight sample chapters, one hundred forty-seven "genetically significant" variations were found. Of particular interest are those places of variation where one of the three textual traditions (Egyptian, Majority text, or "Western") contains a reading different from the other two traditions. It is at those types of division within the manuscript tradition that the textual nature of Codex 1739 can become most apparent.

Twenty-six times, within these one hundred forty-seven potentially genetically significant variations, a relatively pure form of the Egyptian text stood against the other two textual traditions. Codex 1739 agreed with the Egyptian text seventeen of those twenty-six times (65.4%). There were twenty-eight instances in which a relatively pure form of the Majority text read against the other two traditions; Codex 1739 supported the Majority text nine times (32.1%). A relatively pure form of the Bezan text read against the other two traditions sixty-six times; Codex 1739 shared Bezae's reading eleven of those times (17%).

Within this same set of variations, the reading of Codex 1739

⁽¹⁷⁾Ibid. For the list of genetically significant variations used in this investigation, cf. T. C. GEER, Jr., "An Investigation of a Select Group of So-Called Western Cursives in Acts", Ph. D. dissertation, Boston University (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 8522956, 1985) 140-169.

was supported by either Codex Sinaiticus or Codex Vaticanus 70.7% of the time (one hundred four places); it was supported by the Majority text 58.5% of the time (eighty-six times); and by Codex Bezae 32.7% of the time (in forty-eight of the variations). So the descending order of witnesses in relation to Codex 1739 that was observed earlier (Column I), i.e., Egyptian text, Majority text, and "Western" text, is further confirmed by the potentially genetically significant variations in these eight sample chapters.

The matter of the Majority text's influence on Codex 1739 is not of great interest; if anything, that influence is much less than would be expected in a tenth-century minuscule. The interesting aspect is the small, but perhaps significant, "Western" influence. The following is a close examination of those times Codex 1739 agrees with what has generally been regarded as a "Western" reading.

The first of these is the well known confession of the Ethiopian Eunuch, at 8,37:

εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ, Εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, ἔξεστιν· ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε, Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν

E 36 88^m 323 453 913 945 1739 1891

it vg^{cl} sy^h* mae Ir Cyp TR

omit - P⁴⁵ P⁷⁴ κ A B C Ψ H L P 049 33 69 81 88 104 105 181 326
383 614 1175 1241 1245 1611 1874 MT

The confession is supported by Codex Laudianus (Codex Bezae is not extant for this passage) and several minuscules, including Codex 1739. The familial relationship between Codex 1739 and Codices 945 and 1891 has already been mentioned and will be discussed later. Manuscript 323 is an eleventh-century minuscule. Its text is fairly mixed, though significantly closer to the Majority text tradition than to the Egyptian text (it has an 81.5% agreement with the Majority text, and a 61.5% agreement with Codex Vaticanus). Codex 453 is a fourteenth-century manuscript. Its text is very mixed, with only a slightly higher percentage of agreement with the Egyptian tradition than with the Majority text (its percentage of agreement with Codex Vaticanus is 71.1%, while its percentage of agreement with the Majority text is 67.9%). As can be seen from Column I, on page 29f, these two manuscripts have a higher percentage of agreement with Codex 1739 than any manuscripts other than Codices 945 and

1891⁽¹⁸⁾. Codex 913 is another fourteenth-century minuscule. It basically belongs to the Majority text tradition in Acts (its percentage of agreement with the Majority text is 75.9%; with Codex Vaticanus, 54.6%), but it, like Codex 1739, contains a few "Western" readings in Acts. Unfortunately, nothing is known about Codex 36, the one other Greek manuscript sharing this reading. The Ethiopian's confession is also in the *Textus Receptus*, though not in the Majority text; it is in the majority of the Old Latin witnesses, the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, it is an asterisked reading in the Syriac Harclean, and it is found in the Middle Egyptian, which shares many of Codex Bezae's readings. It is also supported by Irenaeus and Cyprian.

The second such reading is only two verses later, at 8,39:

πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον ἄγγελος δὲ κυρίου
A 36 88^{ms} 323 453 913 945 1739 1891 it^{l,p,w} (sy^{h**})
mae

πνεῦμα κυρίου P^{45vid} P⁷⁴ κ B C E Ψ H L P 049 33 69 81 88 104 105
181 326 383 614 1175 1241 1245 1611 1874 MT

Here, the Eunuch has been baptized by Philip; the Egyptian and the Majority texts agree in saying that "The Spirit of the Lord snatched Philip away". A few other manuscripts, however, read, "The Spirit of the Lord fell upon the Eunuch and an angel of the Lord snatched Philip away". The similarity of support between this variation and that at 8,37 is striking, particularly, perhaps, the fact that each is in the margin of Codex 88. However, it does not appear that the two readings were necessarily connected. There is, again, one uncial supporting the reading, this time Codex Alexandrinus, the same group of minuscules, some of the Old Latin witnesses, the Middle Egyptian, and it, too, is an asterisked reading in the Syriac Harclean.

The third, fourth, and fifth "Western" additions which Codex 1739 shares are found in chapter 14:

14,10 εἶπεν μεγάλη φωνὴ σοι λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ
C D (E) (Ψ) (33) 36 (88) 181 323 383 614 945 1175
1739 1891 it^{h,t} sy^{p,hms} co Ir^{lat}

(18) Codices 323 and 453 were collated for this study. They have some interesting and frequent agreements with Codices 945, 1739, and 1891, but those agreements are not significant enough for them to be considered part of the family of manuscripts discussed on pp. 39-41.

εἶπεν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ

P⁷⁴ κ A B H L P 049 81 104 105 326 913 1241 1245
1611 1874 MT

14,19 διατριβόντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ διδασκόντων ἐπῆλθον

C D E 6 33 36 69 81 181 323 326 453 945 1175 1739
1891 it^h sy^{hms} mae

ἐπῆλθον δέ

P⁴⁵ κ A B Ψ H L P 049 104 105 383 614 1241 (1245)
1611 MT

14,19 καὶ διαλεγομένων αὐτῶν παρρησίᾳ ἀνέπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους
ἀποστήναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν λέγοντες ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς λέγουσιν ἀλλὰ
πάντα ψεύδονται

(C) 6 36 69 81 88 104 181 326 453 913 945 1175 1739
1891 (it^h) sy^{hms} mae

καὶ πείσαντες τοὺς ὄχλους

P⁴⁵ P⁷⁴ κ A B D E Ψ H L P 049 33 105 383 614 1241
1245 1611 1874 MT

The range of support for each of these readings is, again, very similar. Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus supports each reading, as do Codices 36, 181, 945, 1175, 1739, and 1891, along with it^h and sy^{hms}. Interestingly, manuscripts D and E support the first two of these, but they omit the longer addition in v. 19.

The sixth and seventh "Western" readings within the eight sample chapters that Codex 1739 shares are at 15,10 and 15,29, where several witnesses add the negative Golden Rule after the prohibitions of the Apostolic Decree:

15,20 τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ὅσα ἂν μὴ θέλωσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέροις
μὴ ποιεῖν

D 323 945 1739 1891 sa Ir^{lat}

τοῦ αἵματος

P⁴⁵ P⁷⁴ κ A B E Ψ H L P 049 33 69 81 88 104 105 181
325 326 383 453 614 913 1175 1241 1245 1611 1874
MT

15,29 πορνείας καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέροις μὴ
ποιεῖν

D 323 614 945 1739 1891 it^{h,w} sy^{h**} sa Ir Cy

πορνείας P⁷⁴ κ A B C E Ψ H L P 049 33 69 81 88 104 105 181
325 326 383 453 913 1175 1241 1245 1611 1874 MT

At 15,20, Codex 1739 is joined by D, 323, 945, 1891, the Sahidic, and Irenaeus. At 15,29, Codex 1739 is supported by D, 323, 614, 945, 1891, some of the Old Latin witnesses, the Sahidic, Irenaeus, Cyprian, and it is an asterisked reading in the Syriac Harclean.

The eighth "Western" reading supported by Codex 1739 is at 15,34:

ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σιλᾷ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ

(C) 33 88 181 323 (326) 383 453 614 (945) 1175 1611 1739
1891 sy^{h**} sa bo^{ms}

ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σιλᾷ ἐπιμεῖναι πρὸς αὐτούς, μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη

D it^{sig.w,l} vg^{cl} TR

omit - P⁷⁴ κ A B Ψ E H L P 049 69 81 104 105 325 913 1241 1245
1874 MT

Here, verse 34 is added by several manuscripts to account for Silas' presence with Paul at the beginning of chapter 16. An extended version of the verse is included in Codex Bezae and a few others, while a shorter version of the verse is found in C and several minuscules.

The ninth, and last, significant reading of this type in the eight sample chapters⁽¹⁹⁾ is at 24,6-8, where Tertullus' case against Paul

(19) The sample chapters used in this study were chosen with two things in mind: 1) an effort to obtain a significant cross-section of the book, and 2) an interest in including those chapters in which the "Western" element seems to have been the most prevalent. Unexpectedly, these nine "Western" readings are the only ones Codex 1739 contains in Acts. There are, however, three other instances in which Codex 1739 agrees with Codex Bezae. These are not "Western" readings, but are included in the interest of completeness:

18,25 τὴν ὁδὸν P⁴¹ P⁷⁴ κ A B E H L P Ψ 049 33 69 88 104 105 181
325 326 383 614 913 1175 1241 1245 1611 1874
MT

τόν λόγον D 323 453 945 1739 1891

20,1 πορεύεσθαι (πορευθῆναι) εἰς Μακεδονίαν

P⁷⁴ κ (A) B (H) L (P) (Ψ) (049) 33 69 (88) 104 (105)

before Felix is lengthened by an account of Lysias' rescue of Paul from the hands of the Jews:

καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον ἠθελήσαμεν κρίναι. παρελθὼν δὲ Λυσίας ὁ χιλιάρχος μετὰ πολλῆς βίας ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν ἀπήγαγεν κελεύσας τοὺς κατηγοροὺς αὐτοῦ ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ σέ

E Ψ 33 (69) 88 104 181 323 453 614 913 945 1611 1739 1891
2495 ^{its} ^{vgl} ^{sy} TR

omit - P⁷⁴ κ A B H L P 049 81 105 325 326 383 1175 1241 1245
1874 MT

All nine of the above variations have been generally regarded as "Western" readings, and it is obviously on the basis of these readings that Codex 1739 was classified as a "Western" witness. However, as has already been indicated, within these nine variations things are not as clear as one might hope. Six of these so-called "Western" readings have some type of Egyptian support among the Greek manuscripts. With the addition of the versional support, there is Egyptian support for eight of the nine, since the Sahidic supports the reading of Codex 1739 at 15,20 and 29. But, even if all nine of these readings were accepted as true "Western" readings, Codex 1739 still does not qualify as a "Western" witness, for there is another very important factor to consider: those places where Codex 1739 does not agree with a distinctive form of the D-text. Examples of such instances can be found on almost every page of the Nestle-Aland apparatus. A very small sampling is presented below:

181 325 326 453 614 913 1175 (1241) (1245) 1611
(1874) (MT)

εἰς Μακεδονίαν

D E (323) 945 1739

20,16 εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ

P⁷⁴ κ A B C D^e E H L P Ψ 049 33 69 88 104 105 181
323 325 326 383 614 913 1175 1241 1245 1611 1874
MT

ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ

D* 945 1739 1891

- 3,11 ἐκπορευομένου δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου συνεξεπορευέτο
κρατῶν αὐτούς· οἱ δὲ θαμβηθέντες ἔστησαν
D it^h mae
- 3,17 ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐπιστάμεθα ὅτι ὑμεῖς
D (E) (it^h) mae
- 4,18 συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ φωνήσαντες αὐτούς
παρηγγείλαντο κατὰ τό
D (it^{g,h} sy^{hms} Lcf)
- 5,22 καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακὴν οὐκ εἶρον αὐτούς ἔσω
D lat (sy^h) mae
- 5,39 οὕτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι· ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν
ἀνθρώπων τούτων
D it^h sy^h mae
- 6,10 τῷ ἀγίῳ ᾧ ἐλάλει διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτούς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ
πάσης παρρησίας· μὴ δυνάμενοι οὐ ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ
D E it^{h,w} (sy^{hms} mae)
- 7,21 ἐκτέθεντος δὲ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν ἀνείλατο αὐτόν
D (E) 88 it^w sy^h mae
- 11,2 ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησε πορευθῆναι εἰς
Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ προσφωνήσας τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ ἐπιστηρίξας
αὐτούς, πολλὸν λόγον ποιούμενος, διὰ τῶν χωρῶν διδάσκων
αὐτούς· ὃς καὶ κατήντησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς τὴν
χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ ἐκ περιτομῆς ἀδελφοὶ διεκρίνοντο πρὸς
αὐτόν.
D it^w vg^{ms} sy^h cor^{G67}
- 13,33 αἰτῆσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ
τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς
D sy^{hms} mae cor^{G67}
- 15,2 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν δι᾽ ὁμοθυ-
μίζοντος, οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ παρήγγειλαν αὐτοῖς
τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ καὶ τισιν ἄλλοις ἀναβαίνειν
D it^{g,w} sy^{hms} mae cor^{G67}
- 18,27 ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντες τινες Κορίνθιοι καὶ ἀκούσαντες
αὐτοῦ παρέκαλουν διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν.
συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίν-
θῳ μαθηταῖς ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα· ὃς ἐπιδημήσας εἰς
τὴν Ἀχαΐαν πολὺ συνεβάλλετο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις
D (sy^{hms})
- 19,1 θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλὴν πορεύεσθαι εἰς
Ἱεροσόλυμα εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν,
διελθὼν δὲ τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη ἔρχεται εἰς Ἐφεσον
D P³⁸ sy^{hms}
- 19,14 ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ τινος ἱερέως ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι
ἔθος εἶχαν τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκίζειν, καὶ εἰσελθόντες πρὸς τὸν
δαιμονιζόμενον ἤρξαντο ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα λέγοντες, Πα-
ραγγέλλομέν σοι ἐν Ἰησοῦ ὃν Παῦλος ἐξελεθεῖν κηρύσσει
D (P³⁸) (it^{g,w} sy^{hms})
....., etc.

The list could go on and on. The import of the "etc." is that, although Codex 1739, along with a few other known Egyptian witnesses, does support a D-type reading nine times in Acts, it does not do so hundreds of times. Thus to designate the text of Acts in Codex 1739 as "Western" is both misleading and incorrect.

It was mentioned earlier that there appears to be a familial relationship between Codex 1739 and Codices 945 and 1891. That will now be explored further.

Codex 945 is an eleventh-century minuscule which contains the Gospels, Acts, and the Pauline letters. It, like Codex 1739, is more closely related to the Egyptian textual tradition than to the other two traditions in Acts. However, in the first sixteen chapters, its text seems to have been altered to conform to the Majority text norm. It contains the same nine "Western" readings that are found in Codex 1739 (cf. pp. 33-37).

Codex 1891 is a tenth-century minuscule which contains Acts, the Catholic letters, and the Pauline letters. Like Codex 945, it has a higher percentage of agreement with the Majority text in the first sixteen chapters than thereafter. For some unknown reason, Codex 1891 was influenced significantly by the Majority text tradition in chapter twenty-eight (agreeing with the Majority text 90.2%). It also contains the same "Western" readings as Codices 945 and 1739 (cf. pp. 33-37).

It was observed in Column I of Chart I (p. 29f) that these two manuscripts agree with Codex 1739 over 94.4% of the time in the whole book of Acts. The percentages of agreement of these three manuscripts by sections of Acts is given below (the figures marked with an asterisk are Codex 1891's percentages of agreement, omitting chapter twenty-eight)⁽²⁰⁾:

⁽²⁰⁾ It may be helpful to see the number of variations at which these three manuscripts differ throughout all of Acts. Codices 945 and 1739 agree with each other 2270 times within 2405 variations, meaning that they disagree 135 times in all of Acts. Codices 945 and 1891 agree with each other 2141 times at 2290 points of variation; thus they differ 149 times. Codices 1739 and 1891 share the same reading 2170 times within 2291 variants; they differ 121 times (the figures for Codex 1891 omit chapter 28).

Chart II

1739			945
Chapters	945	1891	1891
1-6	92.8%	92.2%	90.2%
7-10	95.1%	95.3%	93.1%
11-15	92.1%	96.3%	95.6%
16-19	94.7%	95.2%	95.2%
20-24	96.3%	93.7%	92.4%
25-28	94.9%	95.2%*	94.0%*
1-14	93.4%	94.9%	93.2%
15-28	95.4%	94.6%	93.8%
1-28	94.4%	94.7%	93.5%

In addition to the percentages of agreement among these three manuscripts that are consistently higher than 90%, the three share forty-eight readings in Acts that are supported only by two or more of the triad (these are presented in Appendix I). Codices 945 and 1891 contain forty-six of these unique readings, while Codex 1739 has forty-five of them. These three manuscripts also share one hundred seven readings that are supported by only a few others (these are presented in Appendix II). The manuscripts' high percentages of agreement with each other and this significant number of unique and near-unique readings in Acts make it possible to refer to the triad as a "family", albeit a small one⁽²¹⁾.

Codex 1739 appears to be the leading member of the group, since it is the least influenced by the Majority text tradition, and because it maintains a more consistent level of relationship to the Egyptian textual tradition to which all three basically belong. More important, however, is Codex 1739's relationship to the reconstructed family text⁽²²⁾. Codex 1739 differs from that text only for-

⁽²¹⁾ For the constitution of a "family", cf. the discussion by E. C. COLWELL, "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts", *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids 1969) 11-15.

⁽²²⁾ The reconstructed text of the family includes Acts 2,6-27,44. As indicated earlier (footnote 13), Acts 1,1-2,5 in Codex 1739 is from a later

ty-eight times in all of Acts. This is a substantially smaller number than the other two members of the family; Codex 1891 departs from the reconstructed text ninety-three times; Codex 945 does so one hundred twenty-one times⁽²³⁾. On this basis, then, the family is designated "Family 1739".

If New Testament textual criticism has, as Aland has claimed⁽²⁴⁾, entered the age of the minuscules, there needs to be a redefinition, and in many cases a more detailed description, of most of the minuscules in Acts if the available critical apparatuses are to be useful. That can only be accomplished if the discipline has also entered the age of complete collations of manuscripts, rather than descriptions based on only a sampling of the evidence. Aland's characterization of Codex 1739, for instance, was based on one hundred six variations, from approximately twenty-four hundred fifty points of variation in Acts. And, although his description of Codex 1739 as a "second-level Egyptian" is correct as far as it goes, his method of reaching that conclusion allowed him to omit the nine readings dealt with in this study, on the basis of which it had been classified as "Western".

It is interesting that, based on the one hundred six variations, Aland classified Codices 945 and 1891 in Category III, while he included Codex 1739 in Category II⁽²⁵⁾. On the basis of a full collation of the manuscripts, it is obvious that the three belong in the same category since they are, after all, members of a family.

This study of Codex 1739 has been an attempt to bring the complete evidence to bear on the matter of Codex 1739's textual affinities in Acts. Von Soden's classification of Codex 1739 as "Western" is incorrect. Codex 1739 is an Egyptian witness that has

hand, and (p. 39) Codex 1891 is strongly influenced by the Majority text tradition in chapter twenty-eight (in fact, it departs from a reconstructed family text of that chapter thirty-five times). This family text, then, includes 944 verses, and approximately 2300 possible points of variation.

⁽²³⁾ These numbers include τέ/δέ interchanges, add/omit of articles, and singular readings of each of the three manuscripts. If these kinds of things were omitted, the variations from the reconstructed family text would be about half the numbers shown for each manuscript.

⁽²⁴⁾ K. ALAND, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Twenty-sixth edition (Stuttgart 1979) 47.

⁽²⁵⁾ K. and B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament*, trans. E. F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids 1987) 157.

been influenced to a certain degree by both the Majority and the "Western" textual traditions in Acts, and it is the leading member of Family 1739 in Acts. Of continuing interest in the study of the history of the text of Acts will be the investigation into how and why this kind of mixture occurred within the later Egyptian tradition.

Abilene Christian University
ACU Station, Box 8113
Abilene, TX 79699 U.S.A.

Thomas C. GEER, Jr.

SOMMAIRE

Cette étude consiste en une recherche sur les affinités textuelles du Codex 1739 dans les Actes. Pour mener à bien ce travail, on a complètement confronté quarante manuscrits grecs des Actes. Le Codex 1739 se révèle appartenir essentiellement à la tradition textuelle Egyptienne dans les Actes, même s'il est influencé dans une certaine mesure par le texte de la Majorité et par des traditions textuelles «occidentales». En cours d'enquête, on a également découvert que le Codex 1739 est le chef de file d'une famille de trois manuscrits dans les Actes, les Codices 945, 1739 et 1891. Les leçons uniques et quasi-uniques de cette petite famille, désignée «Famille 1739», sont présentées en appendices I et II.

Appendix I⁽²⁶⁾

Readings unique to codices 945, 1739, and 1891

1. 3,18 - αὐτοῦ 945 1739 1891
2. 4,14 βλέποντες σὺν αὐτοῖς] σὺν αὐτοῖς βλέποντες 945 1739 1891
3. 5,32 ἔσμεν μάρτυρες] ἐν αὐτῷ μάρτυρες 945 1739 (1891)

(²⁶) The reading on the left is that of N-A²⁶. There are a very few instances in which the apparatus of the N-A²⁶ indicates that an additional manuscript shares one of the following readings. However, since the manuscript(s) indicated could not be consulted, the readings are presented as found in the comparison of the forty Greek manuscripts of this investigation.

4. 7,4 ὑμεῖς νῦν] νῦν ὑμεῖς 945 1739 1891
5. 7,5 αὐτόν] αὐτῆς 945 1739 1891
6. 7,36 τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα] σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα 945 1739 1891
7. 9,13 – ἀπό 945 1739 1891
8. 9,21 ἀγάγῃ] ἀπαγάγῃ 945 1739 1891
9. 9,33 ἐκεῖ ἀνθρωπον] ἀνθρωπον ἐκεῖ 945 1739 1891
10. 10,16 τὸ σκεῦος] ἅπαντα 1739 1891
11. 10,30 μέχρι] ἄχρι 945 1739 1891
12. 10,30 ἐνώπιον] ἐναντίον 945 1739 1891
13. 10,32 μετακάλεσαι] μεταπέμψαι 945 1739 1891
14. 10,32 Σίμωνος] Σίμωνος τινός 945 1739 1891
15. 13,7 θεοῦ] κυρίου 945 1739 1891
16. 13,31 μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ] αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες 945 1739 1891
17. 14,4 – τῆς πόλεως 945 1891
18. 14,22 ἐμμένειν] ἐπιμένειν 945 1891
19. 15,20 καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος] καὶ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τῆς πορνείας 945 1739 1891
20. 17,15 ἡγαγον] ἦλθον 945 1739 1891
21. 18,17 τῷ Γαλλίῳ] ἐμελεν] ἐμελλε τῷ Γαλλίῳ 945 1739 1891
22. 19,16 κατακυριεύσας] κατεκυρίευσεν 945 1739 1891
23. 19,16 ἴσχυσεν] καὶ ἴσχυσεν 945 1739 1891
24. 19,17 γνωστὸν πᾶσιν] πᾶσιν γνωστὸν 945 1739 1891
25. 20,1 μεταπεμψάμενος] μεταστειλάμενος 945 1739 1891
26. 20,3 εἰς] ἐπὶ 945 1739 1891
27. 20,7 μέχρι] ἄχρι 945 1739 1891
28. 20,26 εἰμί] ἐγὼ εἰμί 945 1891
29. 21,6 ἀπησπασάμεθα] ἡσπασάμεθα 945 1739 1891
30. 21,8 ὄντος] τοῦ οὐτος 945 1739 1891 (TR)
31. 21,18 ἐπιούσῃ] ἐπαύριον 945 1739 1891
32. 21,18 πρεσβύτεροι] πρεσβύτεροι πρὸς αὐτόν 945 1739
33. 22,5 εἰς¹] ἐν 945 1739 1891
34. 22,13 κἀγώ] καὶ ἐγὼ 945 1739 1891
35. 22,23 αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλεῖον 945 1739 1891
36. 23,1 ἡμέρας] ὥρας 945 1739 1891
37. 23,6 Σαδδουκαίων τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Φαρισαίων] Φαρισαίων τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Σαδδουκαίων 945 1739 1891
38. 23,18 ἠρώτησεν] ἠρωτα 945 1739 1891
39. 24,19 – ἐπὶ σοῦ 1739 1891
40. 24,20 ἀδίκημα] ἀδίκημα ἐν ἐμοί 945 1739 1891
41. 24,21 σήμερον ἐφ' ὑμῶν] ὑφ' ὑμῶν σήμερον 945 1739 1891
42. 26,10 τῶν ἀγίων ἐγώ] ἐγὼ τῶν ἀγίων 945 1739 1891
43. 26,13 μέσης] μεσοῦσης 945 1739 1891
44. 26,18 φῶς] τὸ φῶς 945 1739 1891
45. 26,26 τούτων²] ἐγὼ τούτων 945 1739 1891
46. 27,8 τέ] δέ 945 1739 1891
47. 27,33 δὲ οὐ] οὖν 945 1739 1891
48. 28,5 ἔπαθεν] ἔπασχεν 945 1739

Appendix II

Readings shared by codices 945, 1739, 1891, and a few others (three or less)

1. 1,22 τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς] ἧς ἡμέρας 323 945 1739
2. 2,30 καθίσαι] ἀνάστησεν τὸν Χριστὸν καθίσαι (323) 1739 1891
3. 2,38 ἐπὶ τῷ] ἐν τῷ B C D 945 1739 1891
4. 2,38 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ D E 614 945 1739 1891
5. 2,47 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό] τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό 69 945 1739 1891
6. 3,2 θύραν] πύλιν E 181 323 945 1739 1891
7. 3,22 εἶπεν] εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας Ψ 945 1611 1739 1891
8. 3,26 ὑμῶν] αὐτοῦ 88 323 913 945 1739 1891
9. 4,18 καλέσαντες] προσκαλεσάμενοι 913 945 1739 1891
10. 4,21 μηδέν] μή D Ψ 945 1739 1891
11. 4,24 ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἤραν φωνήν] ἤραν φωνήν ὁμοθυμαδὸν 69 945 1739 1891
12. 5,25 ὅτι] λέγων ὅτι 453 945 1739 1874 1891 (TR)
13. 5,28 ἐπὶ] ἐν 323 1241 1739 1891
14. 5,40 ἐπὶ] ἐν 323 945 1739 1891
15. 7,2 ἀκούσατε] ἀκούσατε μοῦ 323 453 945 1739 1891
16. 7,42 ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα 323 945 1739 1891
17. 7,51 καρδίαις] ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν κ (323) 945 1175 1739 1891
18. 9,19 τροφήν] τροφῆς 104 323 945 1175 1739 1891
19. 9,28 εἰς] ἐν H 945 1245 1739 1891 (TR)
20. 9,33 – τινά 383 945 1739 1891
21. 10,11 καθιέμενον] δεδέμενον καὶ καθιέμενον 81 323 453 (945) 1739 1891
22. 10,12 ἐρπετά] τὰ ἐρπετά 181 326 945 1739 1874 1891
23. 10,17 – οἱ E 383 945 1739
24. 10,25 πόδας] πόδας αὐτοῦ 323 945 1739 1891
25. 11,8 κοινόν] κοινόν τι 323 913 1739 1891
26. 11,13 ἄγγελον] ἄγγελον τοῦ Θεοῦ 323 945 1739 1891
27. 11,21 αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν τοῦ ἰάσθαι αὐτούς (104) 323 913 945 1739 1891
28. 12,11 κύριος] Θεός 323 453 945 1739 1891
29. 12,19 δέ] τέ A 945 1739 1891
30. 12,21 – ὁ B 88 945 1175 1739 1891
31. 12,25 εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ] ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν 913 945 1739 1891
32. 13,15 οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι πρὸς αὐτούς] πρὸς αὐτούς οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι Ψ 104 945 1739 1891
33. 13,19 κατεκληρονόμησεν] κατεκληροδότησεν 323 945 1739 1891 (TR)
34. 13,25 πόδων] πόδων αὐτοῦ 945 1611 1891
35. 13,26 – ταύτης C 453 945 1891

36. 13,47 – σε² P⁴⁵ 945 1739 1891
37. 14,12 τέ] δέ D 181 945 1739 1891
38. 15,17 – ἄν E 945 1739 1891
39. 15,20 τοῦ αἵματος] τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι
ἐτέροις μὴ ποιεῖν (D) (323) 945 (1739) (1891)
40. 15,26 αὐτῶν] ἑαυτῶν 323 945 1739 1891
41. 15,29 εἰδωλοθύτων] εἰδωλοθύτου 181 383^{vid} 945 1739 1891
42. 15,29 πορνείας] πορνείας καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέροις
μὴ ποιεῖν D 323 614 945 1739 1891
43. 16,15 παρεκάλεσεν] παρεκάλει 945 1175 1739 1891
44. 17,5 πόλιν] πόλιν κατ' αὐτῶν 323 945 1739 1891
45. 17,18 ἀνάστασιν] ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ 323 945 1739 1891
46. 17,26 προστεταγμένους] τεταγμένους 323 945 1739 1891
47. 17,27 καὶ γέ] καίτοιγε κ 323 945 1739 1891 (TR)
48. 18,18 ἀποταξάμενος] ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς 104 323 945 1739 1891
49. 18,25 τὴν ὁδὸν] τὸν λόγον D 323 453 945 1739 1891
50. 18,26 τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ] τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου 323 945 1739 1891
51. 19,3 τέ] δέ D Ψ 945 1739 1891
52. 19,4 Παῦλος] ὁ Παῦλος D 181 453 945 1739 1891
53. 19,4 Ἰησοῦν] Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν Ψ 945 1175 1739 1891
54. 19,12 ἦ] καὶ 88 945 1739 1891
55. 19,16 – ἐπ' αὐτούς E 945 1739 1891
56. 19,26 Ἐφέσου] τῆς Ἐφέσου 69 945 1175 1739 1891
57. 19,27 – τέ 323 453 945 1175 1739 1891
58. 19,34 ἐπιγνόντες] ἐπιγνόντων 453 945 1739 1891 (TR)
59. 19,39 ἐπιζητεῖτε] ζητεῖτε P⁷⁴ E 453 945 1739 1891
60. 20,1 ἀσπασάμενος] ἀσπασάμενός τε 383 945 1739 1891
61. 20,1 – πορεύεσθαι D E (323) 945 1739
62. 20,10 συμπεριλαβὼν] συμπεριλαβὼν αὐτόν 323 453 945 1739 1891
63. 20,16 εἰς] ἐν D* 945 1739 1891
64. 20,22 συναντήσαντα] συμβησόμενα C 945 1175 1739 1891
65. 20,25 τὴν βασιλείαν] τὸ εὐαγγέλιον 323 945 1739 1891
66. 20,26 πάντων] πάντων ὑμῶν E^{vid} 104 326 945 1739 1891
67. 20,32 δυναμένῳ] δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς 323 945 1739 1891
68. 21,5 – ἐξελθόντες A 945 1739
69. 21,13 – εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ 323 383 945 1739 1891
70. 21,15 ἐπισκευασάμενοι] παρασκευασάμενοι C 945 1175 1739 1891
71. 21,24 τὴν κεφαλὴν] τὰς κεφαλὰς 323 945 1739^c 1891
72. 21,24 ὧν] περὶ ὧν C 181 453 945 1739 1891
73. 21,25 κρίναντες φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτούς] κρίναντες μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τηρεῖν
ἀλλὰ φυλάσσεσθαι 181 323 (945) 1739
74. 21,26 προσηνέχθη] προσενέχθη 323 945^{vid} 1739 1891
75. 21,40 σιγῆς γενομένης] γενομένης σιγῆς B 945 1739 1891
76. 22,8 τέ] δέ D 323 945 1739 1891
77. 22,13 ἀνέβλεψα] ἐνέβλεψα 104 1611 1739 1891
78. 22,17 μοὶ ὑποστρέψαντι] μὲ ὑποστρέψαντα 104 945 1175 1739 (1891)
79. 22,17 – μοῦ E 323^{vid} 945 1739 1891
80. 22,22 κάθηκεν] καθήκει Ψ 88 945 1739 1891

81. 22,25 ἐστῶτα] ἐφρεστῶτα 104 323 945 1739 1891
82. 23,2 ἐπέταξεν] ἐκέλευσεν C 88 453 945 1739 1891
83. 23,15 – τοῦ² κ* E 945 1739 1891
84. 24,22 διαγνώσομαι] ἀκριβέστερον διαγνώσομαι 323 945 1739 1891
85. 24,25 μετακαλέσομαι] μεταπέμψομαι 104 614 945 1611 1739 1891
86. 25,3 κατ] παρ' C 453 945 1739 1891
87. 25,5 ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἄτοπον] ἄτοπον ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ 323 945 1739 1891
88. 25,7 αἶ] τοῦ Παύλου ἅ Ψ 945 1739 1891
89. 25,9 δέ] οὖν A 181 945 1739 1891
90. 25,11 αὐτοῖς] τούτοις C L 453 945 1739 1891
91. 25,16 τινά] τινί C 323 945 1739 1891
92. 25,26 κυρίῳ] κυρίῳ μου 104 323 453 945 1739 1891
93. 26,1 περὶ σεαυτοῦ λέγειν] λέγειν περὶ σεαυτοῦ H 945 1739 1891
94. 26,2 ὑπό] παρά P⁷⁴ 945 1739 1891
95. 26,14 εἰς] ἐπὶ 81 181 945 1739 1891
96. 26,18 σκότους] τοῦ σκότους 453 945 1739 1891^c
97. 26,20 ἀπήγγελλον] κατήγγελλον 323 945 1739 1891
98. 26,26 οὐ πείθομαι οὐθέν, οὐ] οὐδὲν πείθομαι, οὐδέ 69 453 945 1739 1891
99. 27,5 – τὴν 614 945 1241 1739 1891
100. 27,7 μὴ προσεῶντος] οὐκ ἐῶντος 323 945 1739 1891
101. 27,22 οὐδεμία] οὐδεμίας 69 323 453 945 1739
102. 27,23 ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ] τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ 325 945 1739 1891 (TR)
103. 27,29 ἐκπέσωμεν] ἐκπέσωσιν 81 325 326 945 1739 1891 (TR)
104. 28,8 ἐπιθείς] ἐπιθείς τε Ψ 69 945 1175 1739
105. 28,14 εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθαμεν] ἦλθαμεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην P⁷⁴ 81 945 1739
106. 28,23 πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν] εἰς τὴν ξενίαν πρὸς αὐτόν 104 913 945 1739
107. 28,31 – πάσης Ψ 945 1611 1739

Rm 1,18-3,20

Incohérence ou cohérence de l'argumentation paulinienne?

Malgré les travaux effectués ces dernières années sur Rm, il nous faut reconnaître que Rm 1,18-3,20 est loin d'avoir révélé tous ses secrets. Si les questions de structure sont moins étudiées qu'au-paravant⁽¹⁾, les commentateurs continuent de buter sur les apparentes incohérences qui grèvent cette section, dont la fonction d'ensemble est par ailleurs diversement perçue.

Tels sont donc les points sur lesquels nous allons nous arrêter: 1) si les propositions de Rm 3 (en particulier 3,20: «par les œuvres de la loi, personne ne sera justifié devant [Dieu]») reflètent la position paulinienne, comment comprendre Rm 2,13 (et tout le bloc alentour: 2,6-16) qui semble contredire cette thèse de fond? C'est identiquement s'interroger sur la pertinence de Rm 2 et la logique de l'argumentation⁽²⁾. 2) L'unité formée par Rm 1,18-3,20 a-t-elle pour fonction de mettre en relief la situation pécheresse de toute l'humanité (pointe anthropologique, comme le pensent la majorité des commentateurs) ou au contraire la justice non-discriminatoire de Dieu (pointe théologique; cf. surtout J. M. Bassler⁽³⁾)?

⁽¹⁾ Cela ne signifie pas qu'elles soient résolues, comme le pensait, avec un peu trop d'optimisme, T. DE KRUYF, «The Perspective of Romans VII», *Miscellanea Neotestamentica* (ed. T. BAARDA) (Leiden 1978) 133: il y aurait unanimité relative sur la structure de Rm 1,16-4,25; selon lui, il n'y a de vraies dissensions que sur l'identité de celui que Paul interpelle en Rm 2: s'agit-il du juif (implicitement) dès Rm 2,1 ou seulement à partir de 2,17?

⁽²⁾ Inutile de revenir encore une fois sur les prises de position de H. RÄISÄNEN, *Paul and the Law* (Tübingen 1983) 94-110, et de E. P. SANDERS, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia 1983) 123-129, tant elles ont défrayé la chronique paulinienne de ces dernières années.

⁽³⁾ *Divine Impartiality. Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBL Diss. Series 59; Chico CA 1982).

I. Remarques sur la composition du passage

1. Examen de quelques hypothèses

Des deux affirmations de Rm 2,13 et 3,20, y en a-t-il une qui ait toutes les chances d'énoncer la pensée de Paul? L'ensemble de la critique répond aussitôt que 3,20 répète ce que l'apôtre dit ailleurs, en Rm et dans ses autres épîtres, qu'elle est donc paulinienne.

Le modèle rhétorique, auquel le passage obéit nettement⁽⁴⁾,

propositio 1,18

narratio 1,18-32⁽⁵⁾

probatio 2,1-3,19⁽⁶⁾

peroratio 3,20

semble confirmer cette impression. Chacun sait en effet qu'une *peroratio* reprend, résume l'argumentation qui précède et fixe la pensée de l'orateur/auteur: Rm 3,20 ayant cette fonction représente à n'en pas douter la pensée de l'apôtre. Que faire alors de Rm 2,13 (voire de Rm 2,6-15)? Nous y reviendrons.

Comme de nombreux autres passages du corpus paulinien, Rm 1,18-3,20 pourrait encore obéir à d'autres lois que celles de la *dispositio* rhétorique. Récemment d'ailleurs, certains types de structura-

(4) Le premier W. WUELLNER, «Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans», *CBQ* 38 (1976) 330-351, a insisté sur le fait que Rm, comme les autres épîtres pauliniennes, devait être interprétée comme une argumentation et pas d'abord ou seulement comme une Briefgattung.

A l'intérieur de l'architecture d'ensemble, chaque grande section, comme c'est le cas en Rm — mais aussi en 1 et 2 Co — obéit à son tour à la dynamique de la *dispositio*.

(5) On aura sans doute remarqué au passage que 1,18-32 a toutes les caractéristiques de la *narratio* — qui n'est pas un récit, mais une preuve par les faits, reconnus et admis par les auditeurs.

(6) Comme d'autres *probationes* pauliniennes, celle-ci finit par un appel à l'Écriture, qui scelle la vérité de l'expérience invoquée.

Profitons-en pour remarquer comment Paul utilise progressivement l'Écriture dans la section: d'abord de brèves allusions, en 1,23 (Ps 105,20 LXX et Gen 1,21,24) et 2,6 (Ps 61,13b et Prov 24,12 LXX); le décalogue en 2,21; ensuite des citations formelles: une brève en 2,24 (Is 52,5 LXX) puis deux en 3,4 (allusion à Ps 115,2 LXX, et mention formelle de Ps 50,6 LXX), enfin Rm 3,9-20 (Ps 13 LXX presque en son entier; Ps 142,2 LXX). En fin de parcours, nous serons à même de percevoir la raison de cette progression.

tion, basés sur les parallélismes et les chiasmes, ont été proposés. Ph. Rolland par exemple, qui propose un plan ou développement en trois étapes⁽⁷⁾:

A: 1,18-23; 1,24-32; 2,1-8;

B: 2,9-16; 2,17-24; 2,25-29;

C: 3,1-4; 3,5-8; 3,9-19; (3,20 = résumé de l'ensemble).

J. M. Bassler également, qui voit Rm 1,16-2,29 divisé en deux parties concentriques (1,16-2,10 et 2,12-29) articulées autour d'un pivot constitué par Rm 2,11⁽⁸⁾. Plutôt que d'examiner dans le détail ces hypothèses pour, au besoin, les améliorer, nous partirons de phénomènes linguistiques jusqu'ici malheureusement ignorés et qui vont se révéler décisifs pour la structuration et donc pour l'interprétation du passage.

(7) *Epître aux Romains. Texte grec structuré* (Rome 1980). Rejoignant l'opinion de nombreux commentateurs, Rolland pense que 1,18-3,20 vise à montrer que «tous, grecs et juifs, sont coupables devant Dieu» (14).

Pour *A* (1,18-2,8), une inclusion formée par *apokalyptetai*, *orgè*, *adikia*, *alètheia* au v.18, *kardia* au v.21 d'une part, et les mêmes mots en 2,5-8 d'autre part, semblerait fixer les limites de cette sous-unité. Mais comme indice, une inclusion est difficile à manier et insuffisante; elle ne sert en réalité qu'à vérifier et confirmer d'autres indices. Or, ici, tout va contre cette division: les temps des verbes (passé en Rm 1,18-31; présent et futur en Rm 2,1-29), le passage de la description (Rm 1,19-32) au style diatribique (Rm 2 et 3), etc., sans parler du lien étroit (de type chiasmique) existant entre 2,7-8 et 2,9-10 et qui interdit de couper au v.8.

(8) *Divine Impartiality*, 139 et 199. Pour 1,16-2,10, Bassler utilise aussi l'inclusion comme critère déterminant et encourt les mêmes critiques. Pour 2,12-29, la disposition s'appuie sur la syntaxe et les groupes dont l'apôtre parle:

v.12-13 general statement (*ouk alla*)

v.14-16 conditional case (*hotan*) *A* Gentiles

v.17-24 conditional case (*ei de*) *B* Jews

v.25 conditional case (*ean*) *B* Jews

v.26 conditional case (*ean*) *A* Gentiles

v.28-29 general statement (*ouk alla*)

Ici encore, les indices sont maigres et méconnaissent des parallélismes massifs à tous les niveaux, ceux relevés par U. Wilckens par exemple:

2,1-10 (ou 11) // 2,17-24

et 2,11 (ou 12)-16 // 2,25-29

(cf. *Der Brief an die Römer (Röm 1-5)* [EKK; Neukirchen 1978] ad locum). Ces déficiences n'infirmant pas automatiquement la thèse d'ensemble de Bassler, comme nous le verrons.

2. L'usage de l'adjectif *pas*

Si nous suivons l'argumentation en examinant la façon dont Paul utilise l'adjectif *pas*, nous ne pouvons que vérifier l'évolution qui parcourt toute la section. Au tout début en effet (1,18.29) *pas* détermine les actions et non les hommes: il n'est pas dit *pantôn tôn anthrôpôn*, mais *pasan asebeian kai adikian*. L'apôtre se garde bien de dire que *tous* les hommes commettent l'injustice, il affirme seulement que la colère de Dieu est révélée contre toute injustice des hommes qui retiennent la vérité, sans qu'on en sache plus sur leur nombre.

A partir de là, il est aisé de repérer comment l'apôtre procède: en un premier temps, il décrit ceux qui font (1,19-31) et approuvent (cf. 1,32) le mal. Mais il ne s'agit pas de *toute* l'humanité, puisque l'étape suivante (2,1ss) nous montre que d'autres désapprouvent et jugent les premiers... tout en faisant comme eux d'ailleurs. Ainsi, deux phases se dessinent déjà: 1) *tous ceux qui* commettent l'injustice et approuvent ceux qui la pratiquent, 2) *tous ceux qui* critiquent et jugent les premiers, mais font les mêmes choses. Ces deux catégories sont-elles les seules? La suite du texte (2,9-15) permet de répondre. Il y aura punition divine pour *tous ceux qui* font le mal (et nous savons par Rm 1 qu'il y en a un certain nombre et qu'ils portent déjà les stigmates de leur punition), et récompense divine pour *tous ceux qui* font le bien (y en a-t-il? Paul semble l'admettre dans l'incise 2,14-15). Mais si leur nombre semble ne pas importer, leur origine est par contre soulignée: juifs *et* grecs, peuvent appartenir à l'une et l'autre catégorie (faire le bien/faire le mal, avec les rétributions qui y sont liées). Ainsi, l'existence d'une catégorie positive (faire le bien) n'est pas exclue, elle est seulement liée à la rétribution divine: Dieu récompensera (au futur) tous ceux-là (qu'il y en ait ou non) car il en va de sa justice!

Jusqu'à présent donc, nous avons deux ensembles négatifs décrits comme existant concrètement: ceux qui font le mal et l'approuvent, ceux qui le désapprouvent et le font tout de même. Un troisième groupe négatif nous est maintenant présenté: les juifs qui prêchent le bien et font pourtant le contraire. Mais notons bien, sous peine de manquer complètement la dynamique de l'argumentation, que Paul ne précise pas davantage leur nombre. Très astucieusement, l'apôtre supprime l'adjectif *pas* de toute l'unité qui concerne les juifs (2,17-29). Mais, dira-t-on, il était déjà question du juif depuis Rm

2,1: peut-être, puisque l'apôtre avait alors dit: «toi qui juges, *qui que tu sois*». «Qui que tu sois», c'est-à-dire, comme la suite l'indique, «juif d'abord, et grec ensuite» (2,9-10). Mais là n'est pas l'important, car la progression se fait à un autre niveau. De 2,1 à 2,17 le saut est qualitatif:

	<i>dire</i>	<i>faire</i>
Rm 2,1-5:	toi qui critiques <i>le mal</i>	et qui fais le mal;
Rm 2,17-24:	toi qui prêches <i>Le Bien</i> (Loi)	et qui fais le mal.

Saut dans la connaissance, dans l'ignominie et l'hypocrisie donc, puisque critiquer le mal et le faire va moins loin que connaître la Loi, la volonté divine en toute sa clarté, la prêcher, s'en glorifier et pourtant y contrevenir. Mais la question nous revient: combien y a-t-il de juifs à vivre dans une telle contradiction? Paul ne le dit pas: certes, le «vous» de Rm 2,24 désigne une totalité qui pourrait les englober *tous*, mais Rm 3,3a semble indiquer au contraire que seuls quelques-uns furent infidèles aux révélations divines. N'y aurait-il donc aucun juif pour enseigner la Loi et la garder fidèlement? Quatrième catégorie introuvable? Les exégètes de tout bord n'ont pas manqué de noter qu'aucun juif pieux (surtout pas le Saul fier de sa fidélité, dont parle Ph 3,6) ne se reconnaîtrait dans la caricature de Rm 2,17-24. Personne ne peut soutenir le contraire, surtout pas Paul qui, jusqu'à présent, n'a donné aucun chiffre! Il a simplement opéré une montée rhétorique digne d'être soulignée:

	<i>dire</i>	<i>faire</i>
Rm 1	a) [1,23] et approuver	faire le mal (v. 18-31), qui fait le mal (v. 32),
Rm 2	b) critiquer le mal c) enseigner Le Bien (Loi)	et faire le mal (v. 1-5), et faire le mal (v. 17-24).

Le lecteur attend donc la suite: n'y a-t-il aucun juif, qui fasse ses délices de la volonté de Dieu pour en vivre? Un autre groupe va-t-il surgir:

Rm 3	d) enseigner Le Bien...	et faire Le Bien? ⁽⁹⁾
------	-------------------------	----------------------------------

⁽⁹⁾ Un groupe intermédiaire aurait pu voir le jour dans l'argumentation: ceux qui connaissent la Loi et la pratiquent irréprochablement, mais prennent occasion de cette fidélité pour mépriser les autres, transgresseurs et infidèles. Le recours au Ps 13 LXX montrera que cette catégorie était *rhétoriquement* inutile.

Rm 3 va apporter une réponse claire: il ne s'agit plus maintenant de *tous les hommes qui...*, mais, de *tout homme* sans exception (Rm 3,4.9.12,19)⁽¹⁰⁾. Toutefois, à la différence de Rm 1 et 2, où, comme l'ont souligné à l'envi les exégètes, il décrivait des faits connus en reprenant des motifs exploités dans le judaïsme de l'époque (Sg Sal; Philon)⁽¹¹⁾, Paul doit maintenant invoquer l'Écriture (Ps 115,2 et Ps 13 LXX), parole véridique et normative, laquelle déclare tout homme⁽¹²⁾ menteur, injuste. Il ne peut plus renvoyer à l'expérience, comme il l'a fait jusqu'à présent à propos de ceux dont tous savaient qu'ils ne vivaient pas ce qu'ils disaient ou confessaient. En effet, comment accuser de contradiction, d'hypocrisie, ceux qui s'attachent à la Loi et veulent la pratiquer de tout leur cœur? Au demeurant, Paul ne dit rien de ceux qui, comme les pénitents de l'Écriture (cf. les Psaumes, les prières de supplication post-exiliques, en particulier celles du livre de Daniel), se reconnaissent pécheurs, injustes et indignes, sans désespérer pour autant de la miséricorde spéciale que Dieu disait réserver à tout juif qui confessait son péché et désirait le pardon.

Où l'examen de l'adjectif *pas* nous a-t-il menés? A repérer la façon dont l'apôtre passe en revue toutes les catégories existantes et possibles pour, progressivement, laisser l'Écriture déclarer que *tous*, païens et juifs, sont *hyp' hamartian* (3,9). Mais quelle fonction donner à cette montée rhétorique? Car la reconnaissance du mensonge et de l'injustice universelles n'avait jamais empêché les écrivains sa-

⁽¹⁰⁾ A l'adjectif *pas*, il faut ajouter son contraire *oudeis* ou les expressions équivalentes de Rm 3,10-12.

Sur les nombreux chiasmes et la structure de Rm 3,10-18, voir L. A. KECK, «The Function of Rom 3:10-18. Observations and Suggestions», *God's Christ and his People* (FS. N.A. Dahl; [ed. J. JERVELL] Oslo 1977) 141-157. Keck pense que les vv.10-18 de Rm 3 constituent la pointe de notre passage (1,18-3,20). Nous allons voir qu'il n'a pas assez tenu compte de tous les phénomènes littéraires.

⁽¹¹⁾ Pour Rm 1, il est inutile de répéter une bibliographie qu'on trouve en tous les commentaires. Pour Rm 2 par contre, comme nous allons le voir, si certaines propositions peuvent renvoyer au monde juif, Paul les reprend en les appliquant à sa manière. Sur ce point important, voir SANDERS, *Paul, The Law and the Jewish People*, 125-129, et surtout BASSLER, *Divine Impartiality*, 121-170.

⁽¹²⁾ Le Ps 13 LXX est évidemment pour Paul un appui rêvé, puisqu'il vise tous les hommes sans exception (*tous hyious tôn anthrôpôn*, v.2).

crés, et la tradition juive à leur suite, de penser que les pauvres de Yhwh, même pécheurs, seraient l'objet d'un traitement à part. Si donc Paul ici n'a fait qu'enfermer «tout le cosmos» (3,19) dans l'injustice, le péché (3,9) et la reconnaissance de sa culpabilité, il n'a en rien balayé la rétribution différente espérée (car promise), pour le juif. Et n'est-ce pas précisément cette différence qu'il fallait faire sauter et qui constituait l'enjeu de l'argumentation?

II. L'arrière-fond juridique et sa fonction

1. *Rm 1-2: juge et parties*

Parallèlement à la montée rhétorique que nous venons de mettre en valeur, Paul souligne un autre aspect dont il nous faut maintenant vérifier l'importance. La *propositio* (1,18) et la *peroratio* (3,20) du passage nous y aident d'ailleurs, puisqu'elles ne renvoient pas seulement à Dieu ou à l'humanité, mais à leur relation, plus précisément à la façon dont Dieu réagit eu égard au comportement négatif des hommes (1,18), ou à l'incapacité dans laquelle tous se trouvent de pouvoir être par eux-mêmes justifiés devant Dieu (3,20).

Car ce dont il est question en 1,18-3,20, c'est à la fois de Dieu et de l'homme, de l'*orgè theou*, en réaction à l'injustice humaine. *Orgè* à laquelle nul n'échappe, comme l'a manifesté la montée rhétorique à propos des diverses classes d'hommes. Paul veut montrer que l'*orgè* les atteint/atteindra tous, *sans différence aucune*, parce que tous sont responsables: la manifestation de la rétribution négative universelle est en même temps manifestation de la justice de Dieu.

2. *Action humaine/réaction divine en Rm 1*

J. M. Bassler⁽¹³⁾ a bien vu que Rm 1 peut être défini comme la répétition d'un même processus, toujours plus explicite:

- agir humain (1,19-23) / réaction divine (1,24),
- agir humain (1,25) / réaction divine (1,26-27),
- agir humain (1,28a) / réaction divine (1,28b-31).

On ne saurait dire que l'apôtre insiste sur l'initiative humaine, si mauvaise soit-elle: il insiste tout autant sur la réaction divine, comme l'indique le nombre croissant de versets qui décrivent les conséquences, les effets de cette réaction, en particulier la longue liste de

(13) *Divine Impartiality*, 129.

vices aux vv. 28b-31. Nous sommes en présence d'un jeu de donnant/donnant — Bassler parle de «jus talionis» — où Dieu a eu le dernier mot.

Mais n'oublions pas que cette logique du rapport entre l'agir humain et la réaction divine n'est possible que parce que les humains décrits en Rm 1,19-32 sont *inexcusables*: c'est le mot *anapologètoi* de 1,20 qui déclenche la série. Sinon, la rétribution divine, qui va s'amplifiant au cours du chapitre, serait d'une injustice flagrante. Le jeu du donnant/donnant dont parle Bassler n'a donc pas d'autre fonction que celle de manifester la juste réaction divine à une conduite humaine en tous points responsable et déjà contradictoire. Rm 1 amorce en quelque sorte une définition de la colère divine (définition complétée en Rm 2-3); celle-ci se présente comme une rétribution négative, déjà à l'œuvre et proportionnée au refus répété des hommes de reconnaître le Dieu qui s'était manifesté à eux et continue de le faire.

3. Rm 2 et sa fonction

Si Rm 1 décrit la relation au passé — depuis les premiers commencements de l'humanité et d'Israël (cf. v.23, l'allusion à Gen 1 et au veau d'or) — un passé où les règles de la rétribution divine s'exercèrent de façon constante, toujours valable donc, Rm 2 considère cette rétribution au futur (vv.6a.13b.16a): pour ceux qui, encore vivants au temps de Paul, ne l'ont toujours pas expérimentée; car Dieu reste patient avec eux. Ils doivent pourtant savoir qu'elle va arriver inexorablement, et selon la même règle (tu as fait cela / tu recevras cela).

Qu'en Rm 2 l'accent soit encore mis sur le jugement et la rétribution (future) de Dieu tout autant que sur les contradictions humaines, la disposition littéraire le met aussi en relief, puisque chaque unité du chapitre finit avec cette thématique (vv.16.29c).

Il existe pourtant une différence radicale entre Rm 1 et Rm 2: on n'y considère plus seulement les humains qui font le mal. Une autre catégorie, nous l'avons déjà dit, est évoquée, celle des hommes de bien. Mais ici encore, Paul ne veut pas insister sur le fait qu'il y a tout de même des gens pour faire le bien et qu'ainsi notre humanité n'est pas aussi pourrie qu'on voudrait le croire. Non, la visée est double:

1) théologique: étant juste juge (cf. l'expression *diakaiokrisia tou theou* en 2,5), Dieu ne peut rendre le mal pour le bien. Un juge dont

la rétribution serait a priori négative mériterait-il le nom de juste? Il lui faut juger sur pièces, autrement dit examiner d'abord l'agir de ceux qui lui font face, au tribunal (2,6)! Ainsi, Paul se devait de mentionner la catégorie des hommes de bien... pour souligner la justice du juge divin dans le prononcé de ses jugements et leur exécution. L'important ici n'est donc pas qu'il y en ait au moins quelques-uns pour faire le bien: même si nous n'en trouvions aucun, cela ne changerait pas la règle divine, qui est de récompenser le bien et punir le mal. Nous avançons ainsi dans la présentation de Dieu juste juge: pour Lui, être tel ce n'est pas seulement rendre aux hommes à la mesure de leur refus caractérisé de Le reconnaître, c'est d'abord⁽¹⁴⁾ faire partager ce qu'Il est lui-même (incorruptibilité, gloire) à ceux qui font le bien: le juste juge ne garde donc pas jalousement ses attributs pour Lui seul.

2) anthropologique. L'existence du groupe des hommes de bien (cf. *panti tô ergazomenô to agathon*, 2,10) a une autre fonction, celle de favoriser le nivellement des rétributions et montrer ainsi que Dieu est juste lorsqu'il punit/récompense juif et grec selon les mêmes critères. Nous avons vu en effet que la seule situation négative dans laquelle se trouve toute l'humanité pécheresse ne saurait justifier la mise à égalité des deux groupes, et Paul le sait très bien⁽¹⁵⁾. Serait-il donc concevable que le païen/grec puisse en vérité être circoncis et le juif incirconcis et qu'ainsi (toujours comme conséquence, notons-le encore) Dieu rétribue le juif comme un païen et le païen comme un juif? Dans la réponse positive qu'il donne en Rm 2, l'apôtre n'innove pas entièrement, mais reprend à sa manière des thèmes, des idées

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. la disposition chiasique des vv.7-10, où les rétributions sont décrites en commençant et finissant par les positives:

a = v.7 positif

b = v.8 négatif

b = v.9 négatif (avec une progression: cf. *pas...*)

a = v.10 positif (id. *pas ho ergazomenos...*)

⁽¹⁵⁾ Le tort d'un certain nombre de commentateurs est de n'interpréter Rm 1,18-3,20 qu'à partir de Rm 3,23, où la seule cause du nivellement mentionnée est l'universalité du péché. Mais le raccourci opéré ici par l'apôtre s'explique par la fonction rhétorique précise du verset à l'intérieur de l'unité littéraire 3,21-26 et par le fait qu'il n'a plus maintenant à montrer la justice égale de Dieu pour tous: en effet, *chôris nomou pephanerôtai* (3,21), ce qui n'était pas l'hypothèse de départ en 1,18-3,20.

qu'on retrouve chez certains auteurs juifs de l'époque et qui doivent refléter un débat déjà existant sur l'identité juive⁽¹⁶⁾. Et c'est ici que Paul se montre astucieux, voire génial: il secoue la différence juif/païen au point même où les juifs de son temps commençaient à s'interroger sérieusement sur les limites de sa pertinence.

Le groupe de ceux qui font le bien est donc un élément essentiel de l'argumentation paulinienne, puisqu'il permet le nivellement ou la mise en question des identités et, par là, des rétributions: si Dieu est juste juge, il doit considérer les actions sans se laisser impressionner par les statuts et les avantages ou privilèges qui en découlent, lui qui nous connaît tous de l'intérieur et sait donc que sans appartenir au peuple de l'alliance, des hommes peuvent être circoncis de cœur. Mais cet élément, dont la *probatio* a besoin pour pouvoir progresser, va-t-il paradoxalement amener l'apôtre à se contredire en fin de parcours? Que Rm 2,6-16 et 3,20 ne semblent pas matériellement compatibles, c'est un fait, et Paul ne pouvait pas ne pas s'en rendre compte: il a sciemment maintenu les deux séries de propositions. Au demeurant, la difficulté tombe lorsqu'on veut bien examiner le passage dans sa dynamique, car les affirmations de Rm 2 précèdent celles de Rm 3: elles ne leur sont pas concomitantes. En Rm 2,12-16.25-29, les statuts et les situations du juif et du grec restent du domaine de l'éventuel⁽¹⁷⁾; et l'on comprend pourquoi: si l'apôtre avait dit dès ce moment-là de son développement, et en utilisant l'Écriture (Ps 13 LXX), que personne au monde n'était et ne pouvait être juste devant Dieu, il n'aurait jamais pu obtenir, nous l'avons déjà vu plus haut, le nivellement des rétributions pour juifs et grecs essentiel à sa thèse. Il importe donc de replacer les énoncés pauliniens à l'intérieur du raisonnement — ici, la *probatio* —, où ils ont

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. BASSLER, *Divine Impartiality*, 142-143, et SANDERS, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People*, 128-129, qui citent surtout Philon. A la suite de Sanders, j'aurais tendance à penser que les propositions de Philon et celles de Paul reflètent un problème majeur de la diaspora juive de l'époque.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. le *hotan* du v.14 et les deux *ean* des vv.25-26. Le qualificatif «éventuel» peut évidemment aller de pair avec l'existence réelle, comme certaines expressions de Rm 2,12-16 et 2,25-29 semblent l'indiquer.

Au demeurant, Paul ne s'en contredirait pas davantage, car la Bible donne de pareils exemples de propositions apparemment incompatibles: ne voit-on pas un psalmiste dire qu'il ne mérite pas le mal qu'on lui fait et, juste après, se déclarer pécheur (Ps 69,5-6)?

une fonction précise. Sinon, il ne nous reste plus qu'à accuser Paul d'inconséquence⁽¹⁸⁾.

4. Le vocabulaire de révélation en Rm 1-2

Nous avons ainsi répondu positivement à la question de la cohérence du raisonnement paulinien (Rm 2,6-16 et Rm 3,30 surtout) sur la justification selon les œuvres, mais nous n'avons pas encore pu déterminer la pointe (théologique ou anthropologique) du passage, tant l'apôtre sait avec dextérité passer d'un acteur à l'autre, présenter l'impartialité divine en même temps que la mise en question des statuts du juif et grec.

Mais qu'il y ait progression dans la pensée, cela est indéniable, et nous allons une fois de plus le vérifier en examinant le vocabulaire. La section commence avec le présent *apokalyptetai*⁽¹⁹⁾, et, de fait, tout au long de Rm 1-2 le lecteur assiste à une véritable révélation, c'est-à-dire, littéralement, à une *apo-kalypsis*, dé-voilement, puisqu'à la fin, en 2,16.29, nous lisons que Dieu connaît le secret des cœurs. L'*orgè* avait commencé par manifester ses effets dans les corps, visiblement, par la perversion et les vices sexuels. Avec Rm 2, Paul nous fait entrer dans le cœur de l'homme, là où se jouent les décisions, et nous y avons noté les contradictions, les mensonges, mais aussi les vraies valeurs, que peuvent cacher les privilèges. Et cette meilleure intelligence de l'homme et de son mystère s'est accompagnée d'une progressive connaissance du juge divin, dont la justice ne consiste pas seulement à punir les méchants comme ils le méritent (Rm 1), mais aussi à juger en scrutant les reins et les cœurs,

⁽¹⁸⁾ Tout dernièrement, K. R. SNODGRASS, «Justification by Grace — to the Doers: an Analysis of the Place of Romans 2 in the Theology of Paul», *NTS* 32 (1987) 72-93, a essayé, après tant d'autres, de montrer la cohérence du passage: la culpabilité de tous (Rm 3), lue en contexte de salut, c'est-à-dire à partir de la vie en J.-C., n'invalide pas Rm 2 qui décrit une situation antérieure à la venue de l'Evangile — selon Snodgrass, il serait pourtant erroné de dire que l'Evangile a renversé la structure distributive décrite en Rm 2. A cette explication, basée sur des considérations théologiques, il faut préférer celle qui prend en compte la dynamique du discours et évalue les énoncés selon leur fonction argumentative.

⁽¹⁹⁾ S'il est difficile d'interpréter ce présent dès l'abord, le reste de la section permet de le faire assez aisément, puisqu'en Rm 1,19-31 les verbes exprimant la rétribution sont au passé, et en Rm 2 au futur: le présent de Rm 1,18 marque la vérité permanente de l'agir divin.

sans se contenter du statut extérieur, pour faire droit à tous impartialement (Rm 2). Punition pour le mal fait, récompense pour le bien opéré, patience, impartialité, connaissance des secrets du cœur: certes la section s'ouvre par la mention de la colère de Dieu, nous avons pourtant peu à peu découvert d'autres dimensions du mystère de sa justice.

III. Rm 3: quel enjeu?

1. Examen des hypothèses

S'il est difficile, à l'aide de Rm 1-2, de voir sur quoi Paul met l'accent, le problème semble se compliquer encore avec Rm 3⁽²⁰⁾. Impressionnés par la finale (vv.10-19), où Paul cite mot pour mot un psaume qui répète à l'envi que pas un seul humain n'est juste de la tête aux pieds, un bon nombre d'exégètes pensent qu'en Rm 3 l'accent est mis sur l'injustice et le péché de tous les hommes sans exception.

Pourtant, l'enjeu de Rm 3 ne peut se donner à lire dans les seuls vv.10-18(19), même si la répétition du même motif (tous sans exception) et sa place en fin de section (cf. les diverses classes d'hommes ci-dessus mentionnées) indique une insistance caractérisée. Au demeurant, la signification d'une répétition vient de sa fonction. Or, si nous allons en amont de la citation biblique (Ps 13 LXX), nous voyons que tout l'effort de Paul en Rm 3 est de maintenir, après avoir répondu à différentes objections, l'égalité dans la rétribution du juif et du grec, cette fois négativement; l'apôtre ne fait qu'y appliquer l'axiome de l'impartialité à la situation universelle de pé-

⁽²⁰⁾ La liste des articles parus ces dernières années sur Rm 3, en particulier sur sa «pointe», est conséquente — ne parlons pas de ceux sur Rm 3,21-31, également fort nombreux. Il serait fastidieux d'énumérer tous les titres; signalons seulement les deux derniers en date, sur le début de Rm 3: H. RÄISÄNEN, «Zum Verständnis von Röm 3,1-8», *SNTU* 10 (1985) 93-108, et C. H. COSGROVE, «What if Some Have Not Believed? The Occasion and Thrust of Romans 3,1-8», *ZNW* 78 (1987) 90-105. On trouvera une bonne bibliographie à la fin de l'article de Räisänen.

Les deux articles ont aussi en commun d'interpréter le passage en fonction de l'Evangile, à cause du verbe *apistein* (alors qu'après Rm 1-2, on attendrait *adikein* ou *parabainein*) qui renverrait au refus des juifs de croire en Jésus.

ché. Le point décisif n'est pas que tous soient pécheurs et coupables, mais qu'en vertu du critère énoncé en Rm 2 ils soient tous ensemble et *sans différence aucune* exposés à la colère.

Selon d'autres commentateurs, la pointe serait plutôt théologique. En effet, après avoir montré que les catégories de juif et de grec sont beaucoup moins rigides, fixes, qu'il n'y paraît, que la rétribution divine s'opère donc en fonction du cœur et non de l'identité extérieure, Paul ne peut que buter sur la question de la fidélité du Dieu (*pistis theou*, Rm 3,4) qui a élu, choisi, et promis à Israël le salut final. L'enjeu de Rm 3 serait ainsi celui de la justice divine⁽²¹⁾. Cette solution est également insuffisante, car elle méconnaît les questions-pivots qui permettent à Rm 3 de s'articuler, celles du v.1: «quelle est donc la supériorité du juif ou quelle est l'utilité de la circoncision?» et celle du v.9, qui fait rebondir la première: «quoi donc? l'emportons-nous [nous, juifs]?». Elle méconnaît aussi l'allusion faite, v.19, aux possibles revendications venant du judaïsme: «... à ceux qui sont sujets de la Loi, *afin que toute bouche soit fermée...*». Manifestement, Rm 3,1-19 vise à balayer les objections qui pourraient être soulevées, soit à propos de Dieu, soit à propos de l'homme. En ces versets, il n'y a donc pas à choisir entre une pointe théologique (Dieu juste) et une autre, anthropologique (tous coupables ou pécheurs), car, comme dans les chapitres précédents, Paul ne sépare ni les questions ni les acteurs. Pour la première fois même, Dieu et l'homme sont directement comparés (vv.4-7):

	Dieu	homme
v.4	<i>alèthès</i>	<i>pseustès</i>
v.5	<i>dikaïosynè</i>	<i>hè adikia hèmôn</i>
v.7	<i>alètheia</i>	<i>en tô emô pseusmati</i>

Qui plus est, pour la première fois encore, Paul fait parler l'accusé et le met en position d'accusateur de Dieu (3,5-8)⁽²²⁾. L'opposition de-

⁽²¹⁾ Qu'entendre par *dikaïosynè* en Rm 3,4,5? Justice purement, uniquement distributive ou à la fois miséricorde et jugement (cf. J. PIPER, «The Righteousness of God in Romans 3,1-8», *TZ* 36 [1980] 3-16)? Je ne prendrai pas position sur ce problème qui ne change rien à la question de la «pointe» du passage; vu d'ailleurs en fonction de la dynamique de l'argumentation, il reste secondaire.

⁽²²⁾ Il y a encore discussion entre les exégètes à propos du style des vv.1-8. Selon certains (cf. D. R. HALL, «Romans 3:1-8 Reconsidered», *NTS* 29

vient dramatiquement forte, puisque le juge divin voit sa parole elle-même utilisée contre lui. Mais le dernier mot lui revient, par l'Écriture, qui est *sa* parole, reconnue d'ailleurs comme telle par le juif: grâce à elle (cf. v.4 et vv.10-18), nous arrivons ainsi en quelque sorte à un verdict (officiel) sur l'identité des acteurs en présence, Dieu juste et toute l'humanité coupable.

2. *La fonction du passage*

Mais cette mise en évidence de l'opposition fondamentale entre la vérité de Dieu et le mensonge de l'homme soulève immédiatement une question redoutable que l'apôtre a prévue et qu'il mentionne: si Dieu a besoin de notre mensonge pour mettre en relief sa gloire et sa vérité, autrement dit s'il faut abaisser l'homme pour élever Dieu, ce dieu est-il aussi «vrai» qu'on le dit? C'est identiquement soulever la question de la fonction de Rm 1,18-3,20. En effet, en 1,16-17, Paul avait fait l'éloge de l'Évangile en qui se révèle la force de Dieu pour le salut de tout croyant et sa justice de la foi à la foi: si l'Évangile est bien cela, pourquoi l'apôtre, aussitôt après (en Rm 1,18), parle-t-il de colère? La proclamation de l'Évangile doit-elle commencer par la révélation de la grâce inouïe reçue en J.-C., de l'amour qui nous précède toujours, ou bien par la mise à nu de la méchanceté et de l'injustice humaines et de leur punition? Il est même étonnant, que juste après avoir mentionné plusieurs fois le Christ comme contenu de l'Évangile (1,3.4.9), Paul n'en parle plus pendant tout le premier développement⁽²³⁾ qui va de 1,18 à 3,20. Bref, pourquoi Paul n'a-t-il pas placé Rm 6 ou Rm 8 juste après Rm

[1983] 183-197), il ne s'agit pas de style diatribique, pour d'autres (cf., tout dernièrement, S. K. STOWERS, «Paul's Dialogue with a Fellow Jew in Romans 3:1-9», *CBQ* 46 [1984] 707-722) le passage porte au contraire toutes les marques de la diatribe. Je serais personnellement en faveur de cette dernière hypothèse, car tous les éléments de la diatribe sont présents. Mais la vraie question est d'en voir la fonction. Or, on n'a pas encore assez insisté sur le fait qu'en Rm les passages diatribiques se trouvent presque exclusivement en des sections où il est question de justice et de loi. Peut-on imaginer que Paul, très au fait des règles oratoires et juridiques, ait pu finir une section où nous sommes imaginaires devant le juge (divin), au tribunal, sans que la partie accusée puisse se défendre ou au moins ouvrir la bouche? La diatribe est ici au service du cadre juridique.

⁽²³⁾ En Rm 2,16b, les mentions de l'Évangile et de J.-C. n'ont aucune fonction dans l'argumentation; ils forment une incise et ferment une sous-unité littéraire.

1,16-17? C'est ici que les impératifs de la rhétorique ancienne prennent toute leur importance et interdisent les interprétations hâtives.

En effet, une bonne argumentation devait parfois commencer à l'aide des catégories ou du point de vue de l'autre partie, pour, peu à peu, l'amener là où il ne pensait pas. Paul fait exactement la même chose en Rm 1,18-3,20. Partant de l'attente de la justice finale, attente forte pour tous les juifs pieux qui désiraient une consolation sans cesse différée, l'apôtre va pouvoir provoquer un effet de surprise: à l'aide de catégories sapientielles, apocalyptiques, et de réflexions du judaïsme de l'époque⁽²⁴⁾, il va, en une montée dramatique étonnante, amener progressivement son lecteur à attendre l'exécution de la sentence, puisque le jugement est définitivement rendu (par la parole divine, ou l'Écriture, en 3,10-19). Or, Rm 3,21 nous fait tomber des nues: la justice divine (et non la colère) a été manifestée (*pephanerôtai*)⁽²⁵⁾. Ce qu'on attendait en Rm 3,10-20 n'est donc pas arrivé. Telle est la surprise: Dieu n'a pas puni; il a même fait le contraire, en nous offrant gracieusement la justification, qui n'exige de nous rien d'autre que d'être crue et reçue.

Ainsi, en mettant progressivement toute l'humanité dans la même situation négative, *sans exception ni privilège* — car telle est la pointe —, l'apôtre ne voulait pas enfoncer les créatures pour réhausser la gloire du créateur, bien plutôt préparer l'annonce de Rm 3,21: l'absence de différences permettait au salut d'atteindre gracieusement tous les humains; personne n'en était exclu — surtout pas le juif qui l'attendait depuis si longtemps⁽²⁶⁾!

⁽²⁴⁾ Ce qui explique l'absence de la terminologie christologique et sotériologique habituelle. Cf. ci-dessus la note 23.

On comprend ainsi pourquoi Rm 1,16-17 n'est pas aussitôt suivi par l'exposé sur la vie nouvelle donnée par l'Évangile: en revenant aux anciennes catégories et à leurs critères, il va provoquer un effet de contraste (cf. 3,21 comparé à Rm 1,18).

⁽²⁵⁾ On aura évidemment noté la différence entre le présent *apokalyptetai* et le parfait *pephanerôtai*: en Rm 1,18 il s'agit d'une loi générale, vérifiée par sa répétition continue; on ne s'étonnera donc pas, après le parfait *pephanerôtai*, de voir Paul renvoyer à l'événement Jésus-Christ.

Quant au factitif (comme tout les verbes grecs à finale en *oô*), il permet d'amorcer le développement sur l'aspect gracieux (c'est Dieu qui a tout *fait*) de la manifestation et de ses conséquences.

⁽²⁶⁾ A la fin de son article «Zum Verständnis von Röm 3,1-8», H. RÄISÄNEN déclare: «Das wahre Problem ist nicht das von Röm 3,9 — 'haben

Conclusion

Au tout début de cet essai, nous avons posé deux questions et pensons y avoir répondu. 1) Tout au long de la section Paul reste parfaitement cohérent avec lui-même: pour juger de la compatibilité de Rm 2,6-16 avec 3,19-20 il importe de tenir compte de la dynamique de l'argumentation ou encore de la fonction rhétorique des énoncés. 2) En Rm 1,18-3,20 le but de Paul n'est ni de défendre la justice divine, ni de montrer que tous les hommes sont coupables et sous la colère, mais de débouter toutes les objections faites à la rétribution égale du juif et du grec: le cadre judiciaire prend ici toute son importance. Ce faisant, Paul peut (Rm 3,21ss) retourner la proposition: si l'on admet qu'il n'y a pas d'exception eu égard à la venue de la colère, ne faut-il pas faire de même pour le don de la justification?

Institut biblique pontifical
25, via della Pilotta
00187 Roma

Jean-Noël ALETTI

SUMMARY

The coherence of the Pauline affirmations in Rom 1-3, especially comparing 2,6-16 with 3,20, has too often been discussed without taking into consideration the logic of the Apostle's language. This article shows how the rhetorical model and the juridical framework allow one to trace the logic of the passage and to determine its intent.

wir einen Vorzug?' — sondern: 'Dürfen wir uns nicht allein zum ewigen Bund Gottes vom Sinai halten'?'» (106). Cette affirmation a été préparée par une comparaison entre Rm 3 et Rm 9, où il montre que le premier prépare le second. Sans nier a priori que ce problème soit sous-jacent, on peut cependant faire observer que pour déterminer quels sont les (vrais) problèmes de l'apôtre, il importe de prendre en compte la dynamique de l'argumentation et les modèles littéraires qui la guident.

Zur Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 16,18–21,23. Weitere Beobachtungen

1. Nach Dtn 5,31 wird das dtn Gesetz Mose am Horeb gewissermaßen als Kommentar und konkrete Entfaltung des Dekalogs mitgeteilt. Unsere Kenntnis der altorientalischen Techniken von Gesetzssystematisierung ermöglicht es heute, auch die Anordnung biblischer Gesetze besser zu verstehen. Bestätigt sich von dorthier die Selbstausslegung des Dtn durch 5,31? In meinem Artikel über "Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12–26 und der Dekalog"⁽¹⁾ habe ich zu zeigen versucht, daß die vorliegende Redaktion von Dtn 12–26 dieses Gesetzeskorpus in der Tat von der Abfolge der Dekaloggebote her disponiert wissen will.

Die Korrespondenzen zwischen Dtn 12–18 und den ersten vier Dekaloggeboten (katholischer Zählung) sind eher vage und global; die Kapitel dürften jener Redaktion im wesentlichen bereits vorgegeben gewesen sein. So, wie sie vorlagen, ließen sie sich offenbar den vier ersten Geboten zuordnen. Dagegen kann man in Dtn 19–25 genaue Entsprechungszonen zum fünften bis zehnten Dekaloggebot feststellen. Das auch hier sicher zum Teil ältere Gesetzesmaterial konnte nach dem Muster des Dekalogs zusammengebaut werden, weil antike Kodifikation thematisch benachbarte Bestimmungen oft assoziativ eingliederte und weil man sich die Möglichkeit zunutze machte, beim Übergang vom einen zum anderen Dekaloggebotsbereich sachlich verschiedene Gesetzesgruppen stilistisch miteinander zu verzahnen.

In dem erwähnten Artikel habe ich nur die Ordnungsprinzipien des ersten Gesetzesblockes, des sogenannten "Privilegrees" in 12,2–16,17, genauer dargestellt. Für die Disposition des zweiten Gesetzesblockes, des "Verfassungsentwurfes" in 16,18–18,22, mußte ein

⁽¹⁾ *Das Deuteronomium. Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (Hrsg. v. N. LOHFINK) (BETL LXVIII; Löwen 1985) 252–272.

Hinweis auf eine Untersuchung von N. Lohfink⁽²⁾ genügen. Aus dem "Straf- und Zivilrecht", wie der dritte Gesetzesblock 19–25 gewöhnlich nichtssagend bezeichnet wird, habe ich schließlich nur den Brückentext in 22,1–12 analysiert, in dem Einzelgesetze zum 5. und solche zum 6. Dekaloggebot ineinander geschoben sind. In diesem und einem weiteren Beitrag möchte ich deshalb die Eingliederung des Verfassungsentwurfes in das dtn Gesetz und den bisher zu kurz gekommenen Aufbau der beiden Teile 16,18–18,22 und 19,1–25,16 beschreiben. Dabei wird auch die These von der Dekalogstruktur des dtn Kodex naturgemäß ausführlicher begründet, als das in meiner ersten Untersuchung möglich war.

Die redaktionelle Überleitung von der Kult- zur Ämtergesetzgebung:
Dtn 16,18–17,1

2. Die Ämtergesetze des Dtn beginnen in 16,18 ohne "markante Überschrift" bzw. "Einleitung"⁽³⁾. Angesichts der Organisation des gesamten Dtn ist beides allerdings auch nicht zu erwarten⁽⁴⁾. Doch wird der thematisch "abrupte" Einsatz⁽⁵⁾ mit Richtern und Listenführern⁽⁶⁾ nach den Gesetzen über die Wallfahrtsfeste durch eine Überleitungstechnik aufgefangen. Ich habe diese Technik zunächst in 22,1–12 festgestellt. Davon inspiriert hat U. Rütterswörden⁽⁷⁾ sie dann in 16,18*.19.21f gesehen und als vordeuteronomistischen Übergang von 16,1–17 zu 17, (2ff.) 8ff erklärt. Die vorliegende Studie versucht keine literarkritischen Rekonstruktionen, sondern gilt der redaktio-

(2) "Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Tora und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach den Ämtergesetzen des Buches Deuteronomium (Dt 16,18–18,22)", *Testimonium Veritati* (FS W. Kempf [Hrsg. v. H. WOLTER] FThSt 7; Frankfurt / M. 1971) 143–155.

(3) U. RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde*, Studien zu Dt 16,18–18,22 (BBB 65; Frankfurt / M. 1987) 30 bzw. 11.

(4) S. dazu zuletzt G. BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium 1–16,17* (Die Neue Echter-Bibel: Kommentar zum Alten Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung 15; Würzburg 1986) 5–7.

(5) LOHFINK, "Sicherung", 144.

(6) Mit betont vorausgestelltem Objekt beginnen Gesetze auch in 13,1; 15,19; 16,9.13.

(7) *Gemeinde*, 29f.

nellen Endgestalt des Textes⁽⁸⁾. So mag die Frage nach dem Alter des Phänomens offen bleiben. Ich beschreibe im folgenden die redaktionelle Nahtstelle zuerst kurz thematisch, stelle dann die Texte vor, die zum ihnen vorausgehenden oder nachfolgenden Gesetzesblock sachliche bzw. sprachliche Bezüge erkennen lassen, und nenne schließlich jene Passagen, die keine Überleitungsfunktionen erfüllen.

3. In 16,18–17,1 werden Kult- (12,2–16,17) und Ämtergesetzgebung (16,18–18,22) zunächst einmal thematisch ineinander verschränkt: auf Bestimmungen über die Rechtsprechung (16,18–20) folgen Verbote, die den Kult betreffen (16,21f; 17,1). Abschließend werden beide Sachbereiche im Modellprozeß bei Verehrung von Gestirngöttern (17,2–7) verbunden. Das dann folgende Verfahren bei komplizierten, auch nicht-kultischen Streitfällen (17,8–13) führt nur mehr die Gerichtsthematik weiter. Es ist zwar im Zentralheiligtum lokalisiert, aber nicht um Gottesurteile zu ermöglichen, sondern wegen der Tora, die dort aufbewahrt wird und einen Rechtsentscheid gestattet. Im übrigen schwingt im Wechsel der Thematik auch der den vorausgehenden Gesetzesblock (12,2–16,17) prägende Rhythmus von Kult- und Sozialgesetzen noch irgendwie weiter.

4. Für die Richter und Listenführer ist es nach 16,18 kennzeichnend, daß sie "in allen Stadtbereichen, die Jahwe, dein Gott, dir gibt", amtieren. Š'r wird mit einem Landgabesatz sonst im Dtn nur noch 16,5 und 17,2 verbunden. Redaktionell heißt das: Gleich zu Beginn des ersten Ämtergesetzes werden das letzte Opfergesetz der dtn Kultordnung, Pesah-Mašot (16,1–8), und das erste, die Ortsgerichte betreffende Gesetz durch Š'r+Landgabesatz miteinander verklammert. Der Bezug zu 17,2, wo nochmals ein Gesetz über die Ortsgerichte mit einem an Š'r angehängten Landgabesatz eingeleitet wird, ist später noch auszuwerten.

16,21f knüpft mit den apodiktischen Verboten "keinen Kultpfahl, keinerlei Holz" neben dem Jahwealtar einzupflanzen und kein "Steinmal von der Art, die Jahwe haßt", zu errichten, vor allem an den ersten Paragraphen der Kultgesetzgebung, also das Gebot, kanaanäische Kultstätten zu zerstören (12,2f), an. Der dtn Kodex spricht nämlich nur in 12,3 und 16,21.22a von 'ăšērâ und maššêbâ⁽⁹⁾. 'êš

⁽⁸⁾ Damit schließe ich weder eine ursprünglich selbständige Existenz einzelner Gesetze noch vorausgehende Redigierungen unterschiedlicher Zielsetzung aus. S. dazu BRAULIK, "Dekalog", 259.

⁽⁹⁾ Im übrigen Dtn stehen beide Ausdrücke noch in 7,5.

wird zwar später noch in mehreren dtn Gesetzen gebraucht und kann verschiedenes bezeichnen, findet sich aber nach 12,2 in 16,21a zum erstenmal. Mehr noch: Der Ausdruck *kol 'ēš* wird – von 22,6 abgesehen⁽¹⁰⁾ – nur an diesen beiden Stellen verwendet⁽¹¹⁾. Auch das Stichwort *mizbēah* verstärkt den Rückverweis auf das erste Gesetz der dtn Kultordnung: Es konfrontiert den “Altar Jahwes” in 16,21b mit den heidnischen “Altären” von 12,3. Schließlich gehört noch das “Hassen” Jahwes in 16,22b in diesen Sachzusammenhang: *šn'* mit Jahwe als Subjekt ist im Dtn nur mehr in 12,31 belegt, das heißt, im Kontext der kanaanäischen Kultbräuche, die in 12,29-31, am Ende der Opfergesetzgebung und in Entsprechung zur Vernichtung der kanaanäischen Kultstätten in 12,2f⁽¹²⁾, verboten werden.

Greift 16,21f auf die beiden Rahmengesetze (12,2f.29-31) der Opferordnung (12,4-28)⁽¹³⁾ am Beginn der Kultgesetzgebung zurück, so 17,1 auf deren zwei letzte Opfergesetze. 17,1 verbietet die Darbringung jedes fehlerhaften Opfertieres und verallgemeinert damit die Vorschrift von 15,21, die sich nur auf Erstgeburtsoffer (15,19-23) bezieht⁽¹⁴⁾. Die Wendung “(ein Opfer) *zbh lYHWH 'ēlohēkā*” wird im Dtn außerdem noch in 16,2 und hier für das Pesah gebraucht. Es bildet das letzte, im Block der Kultgesetze geregelte Opfer (16,1-8) und ist formulierungsmäßig auf die Bestimmungen über die tierische Erstgeburt zurückbezogen (vgl. 16,2.7). Der Bogen, den 17,1 zurückschlägt, bezieht also auch das Paschagesetz mit ein.

Somit ergibt sich: 16,21f und 17,1 nehmen Anfangs- und Schlußgesetze der dtn Opferordnung auf. Auf redaktioneller Ebene stehen sie damit für die gesamte vorausgehende Kultgesetzgebung⁽¹⁵⁾.

5. 16,18–17,1 verklammert den Verfassungsentwurf mit dem vorausgehenden Gesetzesblock vor allem durch thematische Rückgriffe, nämlich die eingewobenen Kultbestimmungen. Die im Verfas-

⁽¹⁰⁾ Doch fehlt hier der kultische Zusammenhang. Gleiches gilt für *kol 'ēš* in 28,42.

⁽¹¹⁾ Trotz der verschiedenen Funktionen von *'ēš* ist also 16,21 auf 12,2 bezogen – gegen RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 120 Anm. 103.

⁽¹²⁾ Zum Rahmen von 12,2f und 12,29-31 s. BRAULIK, “Dekalog”, 261.

⁽¹³⁾ S. dazu BRAULIK, “Dekalog”, 261.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Vgl. RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 27-29.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Gegen RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 30, der den anvisierten Block der Kultbestimmungen auf 14,22–16,17 beschränkt.

sungsentwurf folgenden Ämtergesetze dagegen werden hauptsächlich durch formulierungsmäßige Vorgriffe vorbereitet.

Die einzelnen Ämter des Verfassungsentwurfes sind mit verschiedenen "Landsätzen" verbunden, die ihren "Ort" charakterisieren⁽¹⁶⁾. Nach 16,18 sollen "Richter und Listenführer in allen Stadtbereichen, die Jahwe, dein Gott, dir in deinen Stammesgebieten gibt", eingesetzt werden. So hängt hier ein Landgabesatz an den *š'ārîm*, wo sich die Lokalgerichte befinden. Seine Formulierung knüpft nicht nur an 16,5 an⁽¹⁷⁾, sondern wird auch nach der Digression der Kultbestimmungen (16,21–17,1) in 17,2 aufgegriffen, um wieder zu den Ortsgerichten zurückzulenken. Das Gesetz über die Ämter von Richtern und Listenführern wird in 16,20 auch durch einen Landgabesatz abgeschlossen. Er bezieht sich auf *'ereš*, das Land, das Israel zur Inbesitznahme (*yrš*) überantwortet ist. Das Königsgesetz nimmt die beiden Sätze von der Gabe des Landes und seiner Inbesitznahme in 17,14 wieder auf⁽¹⁸⁾.

16,19 hat seine Vorlage in Ex 23,2f.6–8. Darüber ist sofort noch mehr zu sagen⁽¹⁹⁾. Die nächste Parallele bildet 1 Sam 8,3. Nur in 1 Sam 8,3 werden wie in Dtn 16,19 *nṯh hi. + mišpāt* — im Gegensatz zu Ex 23,6 ohne Beschränkung auf einen bestimmten Personenkreis⁽²⁰⁾ — und *lqh šōḥad* miteinander verbunden. 1 Sam 8,1–5 erzählt von den Söhnen Samuels, daß sie sich als Richter "bestechen ließen und das Recht beugten". Ihr Versagen bildete den Anlaß zur Einsetzung eines Königs, den man vor allem als besseren Richter erhoffte (1 Sam 8,5.20). In die mosaische Fiktion des dtn Richtergesetzes zurückprojiziert heißt das: Erfüllen die Richter ihr Amt, braucht Israel keinen König. Tatsächlich ist das Königtum das einzige fakultative Amt des Verfassungsentwurfes (17,14f). Darüber hinaus möchte sein Königsgesetz (17,14–20) gerade die "Rechte des Königs" (1 Sam 8,11–17) überwinden. 16,19 zielt also durch die Anspielung von 16,19 auf 1 Sam 8,3 bereits auf das in 17,14 folgende Königsgesetz.

⁽¹⁶⁾ S. dazu auch S. 74.

⁽¹⁷⁾ S. dazu oben S. 65.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Zur vorausgreifenden Anspielung auf das Königsgesetz in 16,19 und vielleicht auch 16,21 s. unten und S. 73.

⁽¹⁹⁾ S. dazu S. 69f.

⁽²⁰⁾ Auch in Dtn 24,17 und 27,19 bezieht sich die Wendung auf sozial Schwache.

17,1a verallgemeinert nicht nur das Verbot von 15,21, sondern formuliert es auch — sachlich unerheblich — um. Erstens spricht es nicht mehr über (Erstlinge von) *bāqār* und *šō'n*, sondern von *šōr* und *šeh*. Dieser Doppelausdruck findet sich im Dtn — verbunden mit *zbh* — nur noch in 18,3⁽²¹⁾. Die Änderung deutet somit einen Bezug zum Priestergesetz (18,1-8) an. Zweitens heißt es statt *kōl mûm rā'* (15,21) in 17,1a nun *mûm kōl dābār rā'*. Von *haddābār hārā'* spricht das anschließende Gesetz beim Abfall zu Gestirnsgöttern (17,2-7) in 17,5⁽²²⁾. Die Wendung findet sich kontextbedingt variiert zu *'šh kaddābār hārā'* (*hazzeh*) schon in 13,12 innerhalb der Apostasiegesetze. 17,5 *'āšû 'et haddābār hārā'* (*hazzeh*) summiert 17,2 *'šh 'et hārā'* ... und 17,4 ... *haddābār*. 17,1a* ist also in seiner Formulierung auf 17,5 abgestimmt und verstärkt das Gefühl textlicher Einheit.

17,1b mündet in die Begründung *kī tō'ābat YHWH 'ēlōhēkā hū'*. Die Wortverbindung *kī tō'ābat YHWH* wird in den Ämtergesetzen nur noch in 18,12 verwendet⁽²³⁾. 17,1b blickt also bereits auf das Prophetengesetz (18,9-22) voraus⁽²⁴⁾.

Zusammenfassend: Von offenbar bewußt gesetzten Formulierungsparallelen her bilden die Ämtergesetze den Horizont der Gesetze des hier untersuchten Übergangsbereiches. 16,18 und 17,1 an dessen Anfang und Ende bereiten durch ihre Stilisierung das anschließende Prozeßgesetz für Ortsgerichte (17,2-7) vor, 16,19 (indirekt) und 20 das Königsgesetz (17,14-20), 17,1a das Priestergesetz (18,1-8) und 17,1b das Prophetengesetz (18,9-22).

6. Dieses Netz gezielter Rückgriffe auf die Rahmengesetze der

(21) Ohne *zbh* steht er 22,1 zu Beginn des dortigen zweiten Übergangstextes.

(22) Auf diesen Stichwortzusammenhang hat auch S. KAUFMAN, "The Structure of the Deuteronomic Law", *Maarav* 1 (1978/1979) 105-158, 134, aufmerksam gemacht.

(23) Im dtn Gesetz ist *kī tō'ābat YHWH 'ēlōhēkā* noch in 22,5; 23,19; 25,16 belegt. Eine fast identische Formulierung — *kī kol tō'ābat YHWH* — findet sich innerhalb des Kodex in 12,31. Es ist jenes Gesetz, auf das auch 16,22 angespielt hat.

(24) Wegen des engen Zusammenhangs, in dem *tō'ēbā* in 17,1 mit *haddābār* steht, konnte *tō'ēbā* auch noch in 17,4 nachklingen. Der Hauptbezugstext innerhalb des Verfassungsentwurfes bleibt trotzdem 18,9-12, wo der Ausdruck gehäuft wie sonst nirgends im Dtn, nämlich drei Mal, verwendet wird.

Kultgesetzgebung und planvoll geordneter Vorwegnahmen von Formulierungen der Ämtergesetzgebung kann seine redaktionelle Verbindungsfunktion nur dann richtig erfüllen, wenn die nicht verwobenen Textteile von 16,18–17,1 keinen sprachlichen Bezug zu den beiden Gesetzesblöcken 12,2–16,17 und 16,18–18,22 haben. Das ist tatsächlich ausnahmslos der Fall und soll im folgenden nachgewiesen werden. Die kritischen Größen sind dabei (*šōṭerim* . . .) *lišbāṭèkā* (16,18a), der Richterspiegel in 16,18b–20a, der anschließende Finalsatz *l'ma'an tiḥjeh* (16,20b*) und die Wendungen *nṭ' 'āšērâ, 'sh mizbah YHWH* (16,21) sowie *qwm hi. maššēbâ* (16,22).

lišbāṭèkā in 16,18a ist syntaktisch schwierig eingepaßt⁽²⁵⁾. Es gehört zum Hauptsatz und ist distributiv zu verstehen: Zugrunde liegen dürfte die Vorstellung eines nach Stämmen gegliederten und in Städten lebenden Israel. Doch bleibt die Frage, warum durch eine solch ungewöhnliche Konstruktion eigens darauf aufmerksam gemacht wird. Für die Ortsrichter ist die Stammesgruppierung belanglos, offenbar aber nicht für die Listenführer. Denn nach dem Sprachgebrauch des Dtn, ja des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks ist der *šōṭer* ein Funktionsträger der Stämme⁽²⁶⁾. Das wird 1,13.15 durch Vorschlag und Ernennung von *'ānāšîm* bzw. *šōṭerim lešibṭèkem* ausdrücklich festgestellt⁽²⁷⁾.

16,18b erinnert durch *špṭ 'et hā'ām* an die Einsetzung von Richtern durch Mose in Ex 18,13–26⁽²⁸⁾. Diese Neuregelung der normalen Rechtsprechung ist schon Dtn 1,16f in die Wüstenzeit zurückprojiziert. 16,18b–19 schließt deshalb auch an diesen Text an. Am deutlichsten geschieht das mit dem Verbot, Personen zu bevorzugen. Der Prohibitiv steht 1,17 und 16,19, fehlt aber in Ex 23,6–8, also jenem Text, der sonst die Vorlage von Dtn 16,19 bildet⁽²⁹⁾. Die Ver-

⁽²⁵⁾ S. dazu RÜTERS WÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 14.

⁽²⁶⁾ U. RÜTERS WÖRDEN, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit*. Eine Studie zu *šr* und vergleichbaren Begriffen (BWANT 117; Stuttgart 1985) 111.

⁽²⁷⁾ RÜTERS WÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 14 übersieht 1,13, rechnet a.a.O. 114 Anm. 26 bei *lešibṭèkem* in 1,15 mit der Möglichkeit einer Glosse und beurteilt schließlich den Ausdruck auch in 16,18 als "wahrscheinlich eine Glosse". Dagegen sprechen nicht zuletzt die im folgenden beobachteten weiteren Berührungspunkte zwischen 16,18–19 und 1,9–18, im Fall der Listenführer speziell 1,13.15.

⁽²⁸⁾ Die Wendung findet sich in Ex 18,13.22.26, ferner in 1 Kön 3,9.

⁽²⁹⁾ Ex 23,6 wird in Dtn 16,19 verkürzt übernommen und dadurch

bote von Ex 23,6 und 8 sind als Prohibitive gestaltet, Ex 23,7 weicht syntaktisch davon ab. Wenn in Dtn 16,19 *lō' takkîr pānîm* an die Stelle von Ex 23,7 tritt, entsteht dadurch eine formmäßig geschlossene Trias von Prohibitiven. Sie eignet sich durch ihre Prägnanz besser als Richterspiegel.

Der Rückgriff von Dtn 16,18f auf 1,16f erklärt noch eine singuläre Formulierung. 1,16f befiehlt: *šepaṭtem šedeq ... lō' takkîrû pānîm bammišpāt*. 16,19a hat auch hier den Prohibitiv verkürzt. Doch durfte der für das Gerichtswesen wichtige Ausdruck *mišpāt* nicht wegfallen. Er spezifiziert nun in 16,18b an der Spitze der Mahnungen die Gerechtigkeit zu *mišpāt šedeq*⁽³⁰⁾.

16,19b hat bei der Begründung des Bestechungsverbotes den ganz seltenen Ausdruck *piqîm* der Vorlage Ex 23,8⁽³¹⁾ durch die überhaupt einmalige Verbindung *'ênê ḥākāmîm* ersetzt. In ihr spiegelt sich höchstwahrscheinlich die Qualifikation der "weisen Männer" (1,13), die Mose 1,15 als Führer und Listenführer (*šōṭṭîm*) stämmeweise einsetzt (*ntn*)⁽³²⁾.

Die Wendung *rdp šedeq* steht außer 16,20a nur noch Jes 51,1. Das Verhältnis beider Stellen zueinander läßt sich nicht weiter bestimmen, eine Beziehung zwischen beiden ist nicht ersichtlich. Auch die Verdopplung von *šedeq* bleibt unerklärt. Wer keinen Zusammenhang zwischen diesen Texten annimmt, ist bei seiner Deutung von 16,20a auf Vermutungen angewiesen. Ich möchte folgende Hypothese probieren. *šedeq* wird im Dtn — und zugleich im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk — nur in 1,16; 16,18.20; 25,15 und innerhalb des Mosesegens in 33,19 verwendet. 16,20 greift zwar auf 16,18 und damit indirekt auch auf 1,16 zurück. Dem im AT nicht mehr belegten zweifachen *šedeq* kommt aber 25,15 am Ende der Einzelgesetze

Rechtsbeugung nicht bloß gegenüber den Armen verboten. Diese Tendenz, Verpflichtungen des Bundesbuches zu verallgemeinern, läßt sich auch sonst im dtn Gesetz feststellen — vgl. z. B. Ex 23,4f mit Dtn 22,1-4. Die Kurzform verdeutlicht darüber hinaus den schon erwähnten Bezug von Dtn 16,19 zu 1 Sam 8,3 — s. dazu S. 67. Daß 16,19 trotz der sachlichen Parallele unabhängig von Ex 23 formuliert worden wäre, ist deshalb ziemlich unwahrscheinlich — gegen RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 21f. S. dazu auch noch die folgenden Beobachtungen.

⁽³⁰⁾ 1,17 dürfte also nicht von 16,19 abhängig sein — gegen RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 21f.

⁽³¹⁾ Sonst nur noch Ex 4,11 belegt.

⁽³²⁾ Vgl. RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 22.

am nächsten. Hier wird "volles und richtiges (*šedeq*) Gewicht..., volles und richtiges (*šedeq*) Hohlmaß" eingeschärft. Sie bilden die Voraussetzung für langes Leben im Land, das Jahwe gibt⁽³³⁾. Das ist auch das Anliegen von 16,20b. Die Formulierung dieses Finalsatzes entspricht – verkürzt, aber genau – nur 4,1b, klammert also an den Beginn der dtn Paränese zurück. Mit diesen Verbindungslinien zwischen 16,20 und 25,15 bzw. 4,1 ist natürlich noch nichts über das zeitliche Hintereinander dieser Texte entschieden. So könnte zum Beispiel der Verfassungsentwurf mit der Kultgesetzgebung verbunden und 16,20 (oder V. 20b) erst bei einer späteren Redigierung eingefügt worden sein. Dafür spricht vielleicht seine "nomistische" Theologie, die die Inbesitznahme des Landes von der vorausgehenden Gesetzesbeobachtung abhängig macht⁽³⁴⁾.

Die nur 16,21 belegte Wendung vom "Einpflanzen einer Asche-ra" dürfte zunächst durch die Redeweise des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks verursacht sein. Die normale Formulierung lautet dort *'šh 'ăšērâ*⁽³⁵⁾. Nun war aber – wie sofort zu zeigen ist – *'šh* für das Herstellen des Jahwealtars reserviert. So wählte der Redaktor in Dtn 16,21 *nî' 'ăšērâ* und verdeutlichte dadurch mit einem polemischen Unterton den Holzcharakter des Kultpfahls. Die Alliteration zwischen *lō' tatteh* (16,19) und *lō' tiṭṭa'* (16,21) verstärkt außerdem stilistisch die syntaktische Entsprechung der beiden dreigliedrigen Prohibitivketten der V. 19 und 21f.

Mit einem einzelnen Altar bezeichnet das Dtn – wie der übliche Ausdruck *mizbah YHWH* beweist⁽³⁶⁾ – immer den allein legiti-

(³³) Der Finalsatz *l'ma'an ya' ārikū(n) yāmekā* hat im Dtn – abgesehen von 5,16 – nur mehr in 6,2 am Anfang der Gesetzespromulgation des Mose eine Parallele. Er bildet also eine gewisse Klammer um die Gesetzesverkündigung.

(³⁴) S. dazu N. LOHFINK, "Kerygmata des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks", *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (FS H. W. Wolff; [Hrsg. v. J. JEREMIAS und L. PERLITT] München 1981) 87-100, 98. Doch kann man auch übersetzen: "...damit du Leben hast und dich des Besitzes des Landes erfreuen kannst..." – LOHFINK, a. a. O. Anm. 40.

(³⁵) 1 Kön 14,15; 16,33; 17,16; 2 Kön 21,3; vgl. 1 Kön 15,13. Die Kombination mit anderen Kultobjekten verändert das Verb: *bnh* 1 Kön 14,23, *nšh* hi. 2 Kön 17,10; vgl. *šim* 2 Kön 21,7, s. dazu aber 21,3.

(³⁶) 12,27a.b; 16,21; 26,4; 27,6; 33,10. In 27,5a begegnet *mizbēah YHWH*, *mizbah* in 27,5b ist darauf zurückbezogen, 27,6 bringt dann die gewohnte Verbindung *mizbah YHWH*.

men Jahwealtar im Zentralheiligtum von Jerusalem. Der Plural steht naturgemäß für die kanaanäischen Altäre⁽³⁷⁾. Weil im Dtn nur 16,21 (*'šh*); 27,5f (*bnh*) und außerdem unterschiedlich von der Anfertigung eines Altars für Jahwe reden, muß der eventuell vorgegebene Sprachgebrauch aus dem deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk erhoben werden. Dort wird ein Altar Jahwes / für Jahwe gewöhnlich "gebaut" (*bnh*)⁽³⁸⁾. Einen unorthodoxen Altar dagegen "macht" man (*'šh*)⁽³⁹⁾, doch wird ein solcher Altar dann niemals Jahwe zugeeignet. 16,21 geht mit dieser Sprachregelung nicht konform⁽⁴⁰⁾. Die Wendung *'šh mizbah YHWH* muß deshalb als Anspielung auf Ex 20,24a.(25a), also das Altargesetz des Bundesbuches, erklärt werden⁽⁴¹⁾. Allerdings hebt sich Dtn 16,21 dann auch wieder nuanciert davon ab. Befiehlt Jahwe Ex 20,24 *mizbah 'ādāmā ta'āseh li*, so schweigt Dtn 16,21 natürlich nicht nur vom Material, sondern läßt Israel "sich" einen Jahwealtar machen. Darf man darin eine unterschwellige Polemik

⁽³⁷⁾ 7,5; 12,3.

⁽³⁸⁾ Dtn 27,5f Israeliten am Garizim; Ri 6,24.26.28 Gideon in Ofra; Ri 21,4 (zum Jahwebezug s. V. 3) Israeliten in Bet-El; 1 Sam 7,17 Samuel in Rama; 1 Sam 14,35 Saul im Gebiet zwischen Michmas und Ajalon; 2 Sam 24,21.25 David auf der Tenne des Jebusiters Arauna in Jerusalem; 1 Kön 9,25 (erst hier!) Salomo im Tempel von Jerusalem. Danach kann entsprechend der Kultzentralisation kein rechtmäßiger Jahwealtar mehr "gebaut" werden. So "stellte" Elija 1 Kön 18,30 den zerstörten Altar Jahwes nur "wieder her" (*rp' pi.*) und "fügte" (*bnh*) V. 32 "die Steine zu einem Altar für den Namen Jahwes". Wenn der Priester Urija 2 Kön 16,11 im Auftrag des Ahas einen neuen großen Altar — allerdings ohne ausdrücklichen Bezug zu "Jahwe" — nach dem Vorbild von Damaskus "baut" (*bnh*) und schließlich Manasse 2 Kön 21,4 sogar "im Hause Jahwes Altäre baut (*bnh mizbēhōt*)", verdeutlicht die bisher Jahwealtären reservierte Redeweise, welcher Frevel hier geschieht.

⁽³⁹⁾ 1 Kön 12,33 Jerobeam in Bet-El; 1 Kön 18,26 die Baalspriester auf dem Karmel; 2 Kön 23,12 beseitigt Joschija die Dachaltäre der Könige von Juda und vor allem die Altäre des Manasse in den Tempelvorhöfen, 2 Kön 23,15 auch den von Jerobeam gemachten Altar. Nur den "goldenen Altar" für das Räucherwerk läßt Salomo in 1 Kön 7,48 "machen", aber zusammen mit anderen Tempelgeräten; vgl. Ex 39,38; 40,5.26.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Dagegen spielt Jos 22,10-34 mit der deuteronomistischen Terminologie, spricht vom "Bauen" eines Altars am Jordan, verbindet in V. 26 *'šh* mit *bnh* und charakterisiert das Unternehmen schließlich in V. 28 als *'šh tabnūt mizbah YHWH*.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Vgl. RÜTERS WÖRDERN, *Gemeinde*, 120 Anm. 104.

angedeutet finden⁽⁴²⁾? Dann wäre dabei wohl an die Altäre des Mannasse zu denken, die er im Jerusalemer Tempel "baute" (2 Kön 21,4f) bzw. "machte" (2 Kön 23,12)⁽⁴³⁾. Auch der von ihm "gemachte" Kultpfahl (2 Kön 21,3), den Joschija später beseitigte (2 Kön 23,6), war ja dort aufgestellt. Im Kontext der Ämtergesetze würde also Dtn 16,21 am Hintergrund mitmalen, von dem sich die Neuordnung des Königtums abhebt.

Ein "Steinmal zu errichten" verbietet wahrscheinlich zunächst nur 16,22, erst später und davon abhängig auch Lev 26,1⁽⁴⁴⁾. Die Wendung *qwm hi. maššēbā* dürfte aber an die auf das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk beschränkte Terminologie für das Aufstellen von Gedenksteinen *qwm hi. 'eben* (oder ähnlich) anknüpfen⁽⁴⁵⁾. Sie unterstriche dann den Steincharakter der Mazzebe analog zu 16,21, wo auf eine im AT ebenfalls einmalige Weise das Holzmaterial der Aschera betont wird. Im übrigen gehört das Steinmal, das Jahwe haßt, mit Altar und Kultpfahl zum normalen Inventar einer kanaanäischen Kultstätte bzw. eines synkretistischen Jahweheiligtums und wird deshalb in Ergänzung dazu untersagt.

Zur Konzeption des Verfassungsentwurfes Dtn 16,18–18,22

7. Der Verfassungsentwurf des Dtn behandelt im Bereich der Ämter in Israel alles, was dafür in Frage kommt⁽⁴⁶⁾, und ist gesetzes-systematisch eine Einheit. Sie wird durch "Landgabesätze" strukturiert: *š'ārēkā / hā'areš 'āšer YHWH 'ēlōhēkā nōtēn lak* 16,18.20; 17,2.14; 18,9. Diese Landgabesätze leiten die einzelnen Ämter ein: 16,18 Richter und Listenführer (16,18–17,13*), 17,14 das Königtum (17,14–20), 18,9 das Amt des Propheten (18,9–22). Nur in 18,1 am Anfang des Priestergesetzes fehlt ein Hinweis auf die "Gabe" des Landes. Das ist sachbedingt: Denn "Landanteil und Erbbesitz" wer-

(42) Vgl. Jos 22,16.19.23; ferner Dtn 16,22, wo verboten wird, "sich" eine Mazzebe aufzustellen.

(43) Dagegen werden die Baalsaltäre auf den Höhen "errichtet" (*qwm hi.*) 2 Kön 21,3, vgl. 1 Kön 16,32.

(44) A. CHOLEWIŃSKI, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*. Eine vergleichende Studie (AnBib 66; Rom 1976) 267–269.

(45) Dtn 27,2.4; Jos 4,9.20; 7,26; 8,29; 24,26.

(46) LOHFINK, "Sicherung", 148.

den den levitischen Priestern ausdrücklich untersagt⁽⁴⁷⁾. Nur in 16,20 und 17,2 stehen Landgabesätze auch innerhalb eines Amtsbereiches, nämlich jenes der Richter. Das mag daher kommen, daß er teilweise zur redaktionellen Überleitung von der Kult- zur Ämtergesetzgebung gehört und außerdem mehrere Gesetze umfaßt. So schließt 16,20 das Gesetz über die Richter (und Listenführer) gegenüber den folgenden Kultbestimmungen (16,21–17,1) ab. 17,2 aber greift nach dieser Digression auf 16,18 zurück und signalisiert damit die Fortsetzung der Gesetze über das Gerichtswesen.

8. Die einzelnen Ämter werden durch ihre Landgabesätze auch lokalisiert. Jahwe gibt Israel jeweils den "Ort", der einem Amt als sein Wirkungsraum bestimmt ist: die einzelnen "Städte" für die Richter und Listenführer (16,18, vgl. 17,2) — in einer auch "die Stätte" (17,8.10; 18,6) für die levitischen Priester —, ferner das "Land" für den König (17,14, vgl. 16,20) und den Propheten (18,9). Wenn die Leviten nicht wie das übrige Israel "Landanteil und Erbbesitz" (*ḥēleq wənaḥālā*) haben dürfen (18,1), dann deshalb, weil Jahwe ihr "Erbbesitz" (*naḥālā*) ist (18,2) und jeder aus diesem Stamm, der in Jerusalem als Priester Dienst tut, die gleiche "Zuteilung" (*ḥēleq*) erhalten soll (18,8).

Das Land wird nicht nur von Jahwe gegeben. Israel "zieht" auch "hinein", "nimmt es in Besitz" und "wohnt" darin (17,14; 18,9; ferner 16,18 und, bezüglich der Völker des Landes und ihres Besitzes, 18,14). Dieser Kontext der Landgabesätze muß mit berücksichtigt werden. Nicht immer werden alle Elemente — Einzug, Inbesitznahme und Wohnen Israels — erwähnt, und auch ihre syntaktische Formulierung variiert. Ferner: Israel siedelt im Land in "Städten" und nach "Stämmen" (16,18), die einzelnen Stämme bekommen im Land ihren "Anteil und Erbbesitz" zugeteilt (18,1). So bildet die "Landgabe" zwar auf seiten Gottes einen einzigen Akt, ist aber auf seiten Israels der Prozeß einer schrittweisen Übernahme und Inkulturation. Die Ämter sind, weil sie verschiedene Verhältnisse —

(47) *ntn* funktioniert auch über die Landgabesätze hinaus im Verfassungsentwurf als Leitwort: Israel "gibt sich" 16,18 Richter und Listenführer, es darf 17,15 keinen Fremden als König "über sich geben". Der Anspruch der Priester gegenüber den Opfernden bzw. dem ganzen Volk ist in 18,3b-4 mit der Forderung "dem Priester geben" gerahmt. Was schließlich die Mantiker angeht, so hat es Jahwe nach 18,14 "Israel anders gegeben": er "gibt" 18,18 einem Propheten wie Mose seine Worte.

zum Beispiel Städte für die Richter, Jerusalem für die levitischen Priester — voraussetzen und bestimmte Bedürfnisse — vor allem nach einem König und Propheten — abdecken, an verschiedene Phasen der “Landnahme” gebunden. Diese werden in den Einleitungen der Gesetze berücksichtigt. Mehr noch: die einzelnen Ämter werden ihrer “historischen” Entstehung nach vorgestellt. Dabei wird aber mit der Periode begonnen, die dem tatsächlich angesprochenen Israel am nächsten liegt, und von ihr aus wird dann kontinuierlich in die Vergangenheit zurückgeschritten. So setzt das Richteramt bereits ein nach Stämmen geordnetes Leben in Städten voraus; die Okkupation des Landes liegt weit zurück und wird deshalb nicht mehr erwähnt (16,18). Einen König darf das Volk einsetzen, wenn es “in das Land hineingezogen ist, es in Besitz genommen hat und darin wohnt” (17,14). Mit dem Priestertum steht Israel gewissermaßen noch vor der Verteilung des Erblandes: Der Stamm Levi soll davon keinen Anteil bekommen (18,1). Einen Propheten als Nachfolger des Mose wird Israel erhalten, wenn es “in das Land hineinzieht” (18,9), Jahwe “die Völker vernichtet” (18,12) und Israel “ihren Besitz übernimmt” (18,14)⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Die geschichtlich orientierte Abfolge der Ämter wird durch eine Assoziationskette⁽⁴⁹⁾ verstärkt. Dabei setzt ebenfalls jedes Amt das

(48) Syntaktisch ist 16,18 ein Injunktiv, 17,14 eine historisierende Gebotseinleitung mit Injunktiv in der Apodosis (17,15), 18,1 ein Prohibitiv, 18,9 eine historisierende Gebotseinleitung mit Prohibitiv in der Apodosis. Die Ämtergesetze enthalten noch weitere solch paarweiser Entsprechungen, die mit dem linearen Aufbauschema zu einem exakt konzipierten Entwurf verwoben sind.

(49) Vgl. LOHFINK, “Sicherung”, 144–147, von dem ich aber in ein paar konkreten Einzelheiten abweiche. Nach RÜTERSWORDEN, *Gemeinde*, 92, erkläre Lohfinks These nur die Themenfolge “Gerichtswesen” — “Ämterwesen”, nicht jedoch die Abfolge der Ämter König — Priester — Prophet. Das einzige Argument, mit dem RÜTERSWORDEN, *Gemeinde*, 146 Anm. 9, dann seine Behauptung stützt — der König habe im Dtn keinen Anteil an der Rechtsprechung — zitiert Lohfink falsch. Nach LOHFINK, “Sicherung”, 145, schließt das Königtum assoziativ an das Gerichtswesen an, weil der König “früher selbst der höchste Richter gewesen war”, es aber — a.a.O. 150 — “entgegen den alten Sitten” nach dem Verfassungsentwurf nicht mehr ist. Lohfink macht durchaus plausibel, wie die Assoziationen damals vom König zum Priester und dann weiter zum Propheten laufen konnten. Trotzdem müssen nicht sie allein die Abfolge bestimmt haben. Es können durchaus verschiedene Schemata und Gesichtspunkte in der gleichen Ämterreihung konvergieren.

ihm folgende als bereits institutionalisiert voraus. Während die Ortsgerichte erst etabliert werden müssen (16,18-20; 17,2-7), erscheint der Zentralgerichtshof (17,8-13) als vorgegeben. Er kann komplizierte Rechtsfälle kompetent behandeln, weil an ihm "die levitischen Priester" (17,9) bzw. "der Priester, der dort steht, um vor Jahwe, deinem Gott, Dienst zu tun", und "der Richter" amtieren. Dieser Richter wird immer im Singular und nach den Priestern bzw. dem Priester genannt (17,9,12). An ihn knüpft das nächste Gesetz an. Denn früher war der König oberster Richter, und von einem nicht mehr greifbaren Zeitpunkt an setzte er in den Garnisonstädten auch seine Richter ein. Diese Funktion ist ihm jetzt genommen. Ähnliches gilt auch für die oberste Heeresleitung, die er einmal innehatte (vgl. zu beiden Aufgaben 1 Sam 8,20). Nach dem dtn Kriegsgesetz (20,1-9) stellen jetzt die Listenführer, die 16,18 neben den Richtern erwähnt, die Truppeneinheiten zusammen und setzen deren Offiziere ein. So muß an dieser Stelle über das Amt des Königs informiert werden, wenn Israel trotz Richter und Listenführer einen König wünschen sollte (17,14-20). Das Königsgesetz verpflichtet ihn zur täglichen Lesung der Tora (17,18f). Weil er sie in Abschrift aus den Händen der levitischen Priester empfängt (17,18), schließt das Gesetz über die levitischen Priester daran passend an (18,1-8). Nach dem Verfassungsentwurf ist der priesterliche Dienst am Zentralheiligtum ganz auf die Tora konzentriert (17,9-12). Opfer darzubringen ist nämlich Sache der Laien (18,3). Früher haben die Leviten auch die Orakelinstrumente Tummim und Urim verwaltet (33,8). Solche Gottesbefragung ist den levitischen Priestern nun entzogen. Alle bekannten nichtisraelitischen mantischen Praktiken werden sogar ausdrücklich verboten. Den je aktuellen Gotteswillen und das Wissen um Zukünftiges soll nur mehr das prophetische Amt vermitteln. Deshalb wird es jetzt vorgestellt (18,9-22).

Mit dem Ordnungsprinzip, die Ämter ihrer Entstehungszeit entsprechend zu reihen, lehnt sich der Verfassungsentwurf vielleicht an die Dispositionsweise des vorausgehenden Gesetzesteiles an. In 14,22-16,17 werden nämlich die Gesetze durch verschiedene Zeitangaben miteinander verknüpft: Ein regelmäßiger Zyklus von Jahren setzt beim Zentralheiligtum ein und mündet in die Wallfahrtsfeste jedes Jahres, zu denen sich Israel dort versammelt⁽⁵⁰⁾. Die anschlie-

(⁵⁰) BRAULIK, "Dekalog", 262-264.

Benden Ämtergesetze verlängern dann diesen Zeitaspekt zurück in die Geschichte.

9. Historische Fakten im umgekehrten Ablauf der Ereignisse zu präsentieren, ist im Dtn nicht ungewöhnlich. Das gilt sogar für die schon kanonische Vorgeschichte. So berichten Dtn 1–3 über die Wanderung vom Gottesberg ins Ostjordanland und seine Okkupation, erst Dtn 5 und 9f über die vorausgegangenen Horebereignisse. 4,33f erinnert zunächst an die Horebtheophanie und erst dann an den Exodus aus Ägypten. Für eine solch rückwärts gewandte Reihenfolge gibt es allerdings immer einen besonderen Grund. Der Verfassungsentwurf will offenbar an den Anfang zurücklenken, dorthin, wo die Ämter ihre letzte Unmittelbarkeit zu Gott und Mensch haben. Denn sie unterscheiden sich wesentlich von ihrem Ursprung her, und zwar nicht nur historisch, sondern auch theologisch und soziologisch. Die Amtsträger werden deshalb auch nach der Art ihrer Designation geordnet. Dabei tritt die menschliche Mitwirkung bei der Einsetzung immer mehr zugunsten der alleinigen Verfügungsgewalt Jahwes zurück⁽⁵¹⁾. Das Achtergewicht liegt dadurch auf dem Prophetentum. Richter und Listenführer soll sich Israel – wohl durch die Sippenhäupter – selbst geben (16,18). Der Zentralgerichtshof ist paritätisch besetzt. Die Bestellung seines Priesters und seines Richters braucht nicht behandelt zu werden, weil sie ja in den entsprechenden Ämtergesetzen geregelt ist⁽⁵²⁾. Ein König wird von Jahwe erwählt und dann vom Volk eingesetzt (17,15). Das Priestertum ist automatisch beim Stamm Levi, den Jahwe zu seinem Dienst erwählt hat (18,1.5). Über die Ausübung priesterlicher Funktionen, die eine Übersiedlung nach

(51) Das hat RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 92f entdeckt.

(52) Das Handeln Gottes betrifft hier noch nicht den Träger des Amtes, sondern erst den Ort, an den es gebunden ist, nämlich "die Stätte, 'āšer yibḥar YHWH 'ēlōhēkā bô (17,8). Aber genau die gleiche Formulierung wird 17,15 für die Erwählung des Königs und 18,5 für die Erwählung des Stammes Levi verwendet, bereitet sie also vor. Dagegen sind die beiden weiteren Belege der auf die Stätte bezogenen Erwählungsformeln in 17,10 und 18,6 von 17,8, aber auch der Königs- und Levierwählung stilistisch abgehoben: ihnen fehlt jeweils 'ēlōhēkā bô. Auf den dtn Propheten kann das Theologumenon der Erwählung nicht angewendet werden, weil ihm, den Jahwe je neu erweckt, die charakteristische Dauer der Erwählung, wie sie bei einem Ort, einer Dynastie und einem Stamm gegeben ist, fehlt. Jedenfalls verstärkt der – sachlich notwendige – Hinweis auf die Erwählung in 17,8 und 10 den Steigerungseffekt.

Jerusalem erfordern, entscheidet aber der einzelne Levit selber (18,6-8)⁽⁵³⁾. Den Propheten läßt Jahwe allein erstehen. Er erfüllt damit zwar den Wunsch Israels (18,16f). Aber für den Propheten gibt es keine menschliche Amtseinführung wie beim König und der Betroffene kann auch nicht mehr wie der einzelne Levit selbst entscheiden, ob er dieses Amt übernehmen möchte⁽⁵⁴⁾.

10. Nicht nur die Einsetzung der Amtsträger, auch ihre Funktionen sind in zunehmendem Maß auf Jahwe ausgerichtet. Bei den Ortsrichtern wird dieser Bezug indirekt und negativ formuliert: Sie werden durch die Kultgesetze (16,21-17,1) und den Apostasieprozeß (17,2-7) für die Reinheit des Glaubens verantwortlich gemacht. Vom Priester am Zentralgerichtshof heißt es 17,12 schon, daß er "dort steht, um vor Jahwe, deinem Gott, Dienst zu tun". Erst das Priestergesetz wird (18,5 und 7), wenn es die gleiche Aufgabe beschreibt, den Gottesbezug weiter steigern. Denn zwischen den Richtern und den Priestern steht — fakultativ — der König. Er soll lernen, "Jahwe, seinen Gott, zu fürchten" (17,19). Danach kann die Würde des priesterlichen Dienstes voll beschrieben werden: Zunächst als "im Namen Jahwes dastehn und Dienst tun" und dann — noch um ein "vor Jahwe" gesteigert — "im Namen Jahwes, seines Gottes, Dienst tun wie alle levitischen Brüder, die dort vor Jahwe stehen" (18,7). So wird also dreimal über den "Jahwedienst" der levitischen Priester gesprochen, zweimal heißt es, daß sie ihn "im Namen Jahwes" ausüben. Vom Propheten aber heißt es dreimal, daß er "im Namen Jahwes spricht" (18,19.20.22), wobei Jahwe das zweimal sogar selbst feststellt (18,19.20).

Die einzelnen Ämter werden also immer stärker auf Gott hin konzentriert. Zugleich sind sie auch immer persönlicher und immer tiefer in der Mitte von ganz Israel verwurzelt. Richter und Listenführer werden nicht näher qualifiziert (16,18). Als König kommt nur ein Bruder (*miqqereb 'ahèkā*) in Frage (17,15). Der Priester muß darüber hinaus zum Stamm Levi gehören (18,5). Der Prophet schließlich kommt weder aus einer bestimmten Stadt noch aus einer Gruppe oder aus einem bestimmten Stamm. Ihn läßt Jahwe aus der Mitte

⁽⁵³⁾ Dieses menschliche Element fehlt bei RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 92.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Auch diese Aspekte sind noch zu RÜTERSWÖRDEN, *Gemeinde*, 92f zu ergänzen.

der ganzen geschwisterlichen Gesellschaft Israels (*miqqirbēkā mē'ahēkā* 18,15) erstehen.

Schließlich wird auch der Kontrast zur dunklen Vorgeschichte der einzelnen Ämter und zur Praxis der Völker immer deutlicher. Der Verfassungsentwurf bildet ja insgesamt das Ergebnis einer kritischen Auseinandersetzung mit den Verhältnissen der Königszeit von Salomo (17,16f) bis Manasse (18,9–11). So konfrontiert der Richterspiegel mit den uralten Möglichkeiten juristischer Ungerechtigkeit (16,19), die anschließenden Kultbestimmungen mit dem, was Jahwe bei Israels Gottesverehrung haßt (16,22) bzw. was ihm ein Greuel ist (17,1). Letztlich sind es alles heidnische Bräuche. Wenn das Volk "einen König wie alle Völker in der Nachbarschaft" wünscht (17,14), dann beschränkt eine Art Königsspiegel seinen Verkehr mit den fremden Völkern (17,16f). Dabei führen die bitteren Erfahrungen, die man vor allem mit der Herrschaft Salomos gemacht hat (vgl. 1 Kön 10,14–11,8), die Feder. Die levitischen Priester werden konsequent unter die Devise "Jahwe ist ihr Erbesitz" (18,2) gestellt. Wenn die Rechte, die sich daraus ergeben, für jeden Leviten, der ans einzige legitime Jahweheiligtum übersiedelt, ausdrücklich geltend gemacht werden (18,6–8), dann läßt sich im Hintergrund die Aufhebung der Höhenkulte und vielleicht auch die Integration der dort tätigen Priester vermuten (vgl. 2 Kön 23,8f). Hat das Königsgesetz noch gestattet, was Israel "wie alle Völker" haben darf, so spricht die Einleitung ins Prophetengesetz zunächst offen aus, welche "Greuel dieser Völker" (18,9, vgl. V. 12) es nicht praktizieren darf (18,9–12)⁽⁵⁵⁾. Als dunkle Folie dient dabei die sich verschlimmernde Sündengeschichte von Juda und Israel bis Manasse (vgl. 1 Kön 14,24; 2 Kön 16,3; 17,17; 21,6). Bisher erschien die Vergangenheit Israels und seiner Ämter nur in Anspielungen. Erst die Einsetzung des Propheten wird ausdrücklich mit einem Geschichtsrückblick begründet. Ebenso werden jetzt auch die Schwierigkeiten Israels beim Umgang mit diesem Amt geregelt (18,20–22)⁽⁵⁶⁾.

11. Die Redaktion hat in 16,18–18,22 nicht nur Gesetze des gleichen Sachbereiches vereinigt, sondern alle nach dem Dtn in Israel möglichen Ämter zu einem exakt konzipierten Verfassungsentwurf

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Zur Ferndeixis von *haggôyim hāhēm* auf die *gôyim* in 17,14 s. RÜTERSWORDEN, *Gemeinde*, 82.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Sie sind vom Ungehorsam des Volkes zu unterscheiden. Darüber wird bei allen mit dem Wort betrauten Ämtern gesprochen: 17,3–5.12; 18,19.20.

gestaltet. Die Dispositionstechniken, die sie dabei zur Systematisierung verwendet, sind aus anderer altorientalischer Rechtskodifikation bekannt⁽⁵⁷⁾: Die Gesetze werden chronologisch gereiht, und zwar nach der Einsetzung der einzelnen Ämter im Verlauf der Geschichte Israels. Sie wird in die Vergangenheit zurückverfolgt. Dafür maßgeblich ist die theologische Bedeutung der Amtsträger und ihre gesellschaftliche Stellung in einem geschwisterlichen Israel. Der Entwurf gipfelt in der Institutionalisierung des prophetischen Charismas. Zwischen den einzelnen Gesetzen bestehen zahlreiche Stichwortverknüpfungen und Assoziationsbrücken. Thematisch Gleichartiges wird innerhalb eines Amtsbereiches zusammengestellt. So werden schon im Rahmen des Gerichtswesens (16,18–17,13) das Prozeßverfahren (bei Apostasie; 17,2–7) und die Rechtsauskunft am Zentralgerichtshof (17,8–13) geregelt. Mittels Attraktion können sogar Kultbestimmungen (16,21f; 17,1) eingefügt werden, denn auf ihre Exekution haben vor allem die Richter zu achten. Ferner verbietet die Einleitung zum Prophetenamt (18,9–14) nichtisraelitische kultische und mantische Praktiken. Trotz der Haupttendenz, die Ämter als einander überbietend darzustellen, sind sie in Einzelheiten auch nach dem Schema "Fall und Gegenfall" stilisiert: So darf Israel zum Beispiel einen König "wie alle Völker in seiner Nachbarschaft" einsetzen (17,14), durch den Propheten aber soll vermieden werden, daß es sich "die Greuel dieser Völker" angewöhnt (18,9 und 14).

Fünftes Gebot "Leben bewahren" – Dtn 19,1–21,23

Im folgenden bespreche ich zunächst die Struktursignale, die den Einsatz des neuen Gesetzesblockes Dtn 19–25 anzeigen. Bei der Analyse der Gesetzessystematik von Dtn 19–21 wähle ich je ein Kapitel als Untersuchungseinheit. Denn die Kapitelgrenzen sind hier sachgerecht gesetzt. Sie gliedern den Text nach zusammengehörenden Gesetzesgruppen. Ich untersuche Verbindungen zwischen den Kapiteln und beschreibe dann die Abfolge der einzelnen Gesetze innerhalb eines Kapitels sowie die Techniken, mit denen sie aneinander gereiht werden. Eigens behandle ich schließlich den Aspekt, unter dem die Endredaktion die Gesetze einem Dekaloggebot zugeordnet hat.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ S. dazu z. B. H. PETSCHOW, "Zur Systematik und Gesetzestechnik im Codex Hammurabi", ZA 57 (1965) 146–172, 170f.

12. Mit Dtn 19 beginnt der dritte und letzte Gesetzesblock des dtn Kodex (19,1–25,19). Mit 19,1 vergleichbare historisierende Gesetzeseinleitungen werden im Kodex sonst noch in 12,29 gebraucht, ferner in 17,14; 18,9 und schließlich in 25,19; 26,1⁽⁵⁸⁾. Ihre unterschiedliche Formulierung ist vor allem sach- bzw. kontextbedingt. 19,1 stimmt am meisten mit 12,29 überein. Nur diese beiden Stellen sprechen nämlich davon, daß Jahwe die Völker niederstrecken und Israel ihren Besitz übernehmen wird. 19,1 klammert also – wie ähnlich zuvor schon 16,18–17,1 – auf den Anfang (12,29) des ersten Gesetzesblockes (12,2–16,17) zurück⁽⁵⁹⁾. Durch die Gemeinsamkeiten mit 17,14 und 18,9 (ergänzt durch V. 14, wo *yrš* q. ebenfalls auf die Bewohner des Landes bezogen ist) setzt 19,1 gewissermaßen das Strukturprinzip des Verfassungsentwurfes fort: Wie die Ämter ist auch die Einrichtung von Asylstädten an bestimmte geschichtliche Voraussetzungen gebunden. Mehr noch: 19,1–2 schließt speziell an 16,18–20 an. Das geschieht durch zwei Landgabesätze, die das Gebot zur Aussonderung von drei Städten wie die Anweisungen für die "Stadt"-Richter gewissermaßen "rahmen" (16,18a.20b* und 19,1a*.2b)⁽⁶⁰⁾. 19,1–2 greift also auch auf den Beginn des zweiten Gesetzesblockes (16,18–18,22) zurück⁽⁶¹⁾. Die in 19,1 tragende Verb-

⁽⁵⁸⁾ S. dazu N. LOHFINK, "שָׁרִי *jrš*", *TWAT* III 953–985, 974–976. 25,19 gehört bereits zur Rahmung des Gesetzeskorpus und verstärkt die parallel gebaute, unmittelbar anschließende Gesetzeseinleitung in 26,1.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ S. dazu S. 65f. Vielleicht ist dieser Rückgriff sogar noch genauer auf die Anspielungstechnik der redaktionellen Überleitung 16,18–17,1 abgestimmt. Die Gerichtsgesetze beginnen ohne historisierende Einleitung und knüpfen in 16,21f vor allem (!) an das ebenfalls ohne solche Einleitung gestaltete Gebot über die Zerstörung kanaänischer Kultstätten in 12,2f an. 19,1 ist mit einer historisierenden Gesetzeseinleitung versehen, und nimmt 12,29 auf, die historisierende Einleitung zum Verbot in 12,30f, die kultischen Sitten der Landesbewohner weiterzuführen. Damit würden Formulierungen von 12,2f und 12,29–31, den beiden Rahmengesetzen der dtn Opfervorschriften, der Reihe nach zu Beginn des zweiten bzw. des dritten Gesetzesblockes aufgegriffen.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Im übrigen dient 'ereš / 'ādāmā 'āšer YHWH 'ēlohēkā nōtēn l'kā (*nahālā*) im ganzen dritten Gesetzesblock als Struktursignal. Es steht außer 19,1.2 noch 19,10.14; 21,1.23; 24,4; 25,15.19; 26,1.2. In 19,8 ist der Landgabesatz unterschiedlich formuliert, in 20,16 gibt Jahwe 'ārē hā'ammīm. Beide Sätze haben aber keine Gliederungsfunktion.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Wie Mose zu Beginn seiner ersten Rede noch vor dem Aufbruch vom Horeb in 1,9–18 (Listen-)Führer und Richter einsetzt und unmittelbar vor seiner zweiten Rede über die Horeboffenbarung in 4,41–43 Asylstädte aussondert, so institutionalisiert das dtn Gesetz am Beginn des zweiten Gesetzes-

folge (YHWH) *ntn* ('eres) — (Israel) *yrš* und *yšb* findet sich erst in 26,1 wieder und leitet dort den liturgischen Anhang zum dtn Gesetz (26,1-15) ein.

Dtn 19

13. Die Ämtergesetze haben in 16,18 bei den "Richtern und Beamten in allen Stadtbereichen" (*še'ārīm*) Israels, also den innerstädtischen Verwaltungseinheiten (16,18; 17,2.8; 18,6)⁽⁶²⁾, angesetzt. Nachdem im Anschluß daran auch die übrigen Ämter geregelt worden sind, handelt Kapitel 19 erneut von der Gerichtsbarkeit. Es spricht aber nicht mehr von *še'ārīm*, sondern beginnt in 19,1 programmatisch bei den "Städten" (*'ārīm*) der Völker und ihren "Häusern", in denen Israel wohnen wird. Beide Ausdrücke fehlen im Verfassungsentwurf, während sie für 19–21⁽⁶³⁾ charakteristisch sind. Verschiedene Gesetze übergreifen nämlich jetzt den Rechtsbereich einer einzigen Stadt. Dementsprechend treten in 19,1-10 und 19,11-13, den zwei Gesetzen über die Asylstädte, nicht mehr die Richter als Rechtsorgane auf, sondern der Bluträcher (19,6) bzw. die Ältesten der Stadt (19,12), die er repräsentiert. Die beiden auf den Grenzverrückungsparagrafen (19,14) folgenden Gesetze orientieren sich weiter an Inhalt und Reihung der Bestimmungen des Verfassungsentwurfes über die Rechtsprechung: 19,15 verallgemeinert die Zeugenregel von 17,6, und 19,16-21 beansprucht in V.17f das Zentralgericht von 17,8-13 für einen durch falsches Zeugnis komplizierten Prozeß⁽⁶⁴⁾.

14. Kapitel 19 lehnt sich zwar in Thematik und Aufbau seiner

blockes das Amt der Richter und Listenführer (16,18-20) und am Beginn des dritten Gesetzesblockes Asylstädte (19,1-10).

⁽⁶²⁾ In 17,5 bezeichnet *še'ārīm* die "Stadtore" als Ort des Gerichts.

⁽⁶³⁾ Zu *'ir* s. 19,1-10.11-13; 20,10-18.19-20; 21,1-9.18-21; zu *bayit* s. 20,1-9; 21,10-14, ferner 22,1-3.8 im Übergangstext zu den Gesetzesgruppen des nächsten Dekalogebotes.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ V. WAGNER, "Der bisher unbeachtete Rest eines hebräischen Rechtskodex", *BZ* 19 (1975) 234-240, 235, übersieht diese Bezüge und nimmt deshalb bei den zwei Rechtssätzen über Zeugenaussage an, sie seien durch Attraktion an diese Stelle gelangt: Im Falle eines Mordes oder Totschlags mußte ja ein Mißbrauch der Zeugenvernehmung oder -aussage besonders folgenreich werden.

Gesetze an 16,18–17,13 an. Trotzdem gilt sein Interesse nicht mehr der Institution des Gerichtes, sondern dessen Umgang mit Fällen, die zum Tod führen (19,1-10.14) oder mit dem Tod bestraft werden können (19,11-13.15.16-21). So stehen die Gesetze in der Spannung zwischen dem Ziel “daß (ein Mensch) am Leben bleibt” (19,4.5 *hyh*), und dem Mittel “Leben für Leben” (19,21 *nepeš benepeš*)⁽⁶⁵⁾. Ihre Intention, unschuldiges Leben zu bewahren, zeigt sich in 19,1-10 bei der Planung der Asylstädte, durch die ein Totschläger effektiv geschützt und so Blutschuld vom Land abgewendet werden soll. Dabei rückt das Dtn im Gegensatz zum älteren Recht (Ex 21,12) auch die Exekution des Mörders in den Hintergrund; sie wird erst als letztes Erfordernis eingeschränkt (19,11-13). Außerdem entscheiden nun ausdrücklich die Ältesten der Stadt, aus der der Flüchtling kommt, ob er aus seinem Asylort weggeholt werden soll. Die Asylstadt aber hat die Auslieferung mitzuverantworten. 19,14 warnt im Zusammenhang “Schutz des Lebens” vor Grenzverrückung. Denn dieses Verbrechen kann von der Rechtsgemeinde nicht effektiv kontrolliert werden, trifft vor allem die sozial Schwachen und gefährdet dann die menschliche Existenz. 19,15 bestimmt das Zweizeugenprinzip, das 17,6 nur für Kapitalverbrechen vorgesehen hat, als für jedes Vergehen gültigen Grundsatz des Strafrechts, weitet also den Rechtsschutz erheblich aus. 19,16-21 beugt einem Justizmord aufgrund falscher Anklage vor. Deshalb wurde das Gesetz redaktionell nicht dem Bereich des 8. Dekaloggebotes (5,20), sondern jenem des Tötungsverbotes zugewiesen. Die harte Sanktion für einen solchen “Gewalt-Zeugen” (19,16) soll aber nicht nur Unrecht vergelten (19,21), sondern hat die erzieherische Funktion, vor der Schädigung eines “Bruders” von vornherein abzuschrecken (19,20). Schließlich liefert auch die redaktionelle Zusammenstellung des Talionsgesetzes mit den Asylgesetzen ein Beispiel für die bloß bedingte Anwendbarkeit des Vergeltungsprinzips⁽⁶⁶⁾.

15. In Dtn 19 sind Gesetze des gleichen Sachbereiches “Gerichtswesen” nach Fall und Gegenfall angeordnet: berechtigter Gebrauch der Zufluchtstädte (V. 1-10) und ihr Mißbrauch (V. 11-13), ordnungsgemäßer Gebrauch der Zeugenaussage (V. 15) und ihr Miß-

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Vgl. R. P. MERENDINO, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz*. Eine literarkritische, gattungs- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Dt 12-26 (BBB 31; Bonn 1969) 218.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ MERENDINO, *Gesetz*, 218.

brauch (V. 16-21). Das Verbot der Grenzverrückung (V. 14) ist assoziativ zwischen Fragen der Grenzziehung im Erbland Israel (V. 1-10) und der Evidenz eines Zeugnisses (V. 15) eingeschoben. Darüber hinaus werden die Gesetze auch noch durch Formeln und Wortklammern miteinander verbunden. Sie finden sich natürlich zwischen den paarweise auf einander abgestimmten Gesetzen (V. 1-10 und 11-13 sowie V. 15 und 16-21). Darüber hinaus verdienen aber die folgenden besondere Erwähnung. Hauptfall (V. 1-7) und Unterfall (V. 8-10)⁽⁶⁷⁾ des Gesetzes über die Asylstädte sind in V. 1-2 und V. 10 durch Landgabesätze gerahmt. Denn das Asyl hängt jetzt nicht mehr an den lokalen Heiligtümern, sondern am Land bzw. den Asylstädten, deren Zahl seiner Größe entsprechen soll. Das Verbot der Grenzverrückung (V. 14) wurde durch die Stichworte *gʿbûl* (in V. 3.8 aber im Sinn von "Gebiet"), *nḥl* hi. (V. 3), *rē'a* (V. 4.5.11), *naḥālā* (V. 10) und einen Landgabesatz formulierungsmäßig besonders stark an die Asylgesetze angepaßt, vermutlich um dadurch seine inhaltliche Digression zu überbrücken. Schließlich spannt sich auch ein Bogen vom Ende der ersten Gesetzesgruppe zum Ende der zweiten: Was V. 13 einschärft — "du sollst kein Mitleid aufsteigen lassen" und "du sollst ... (aus Israel) wegschaffen" — verlangen auch V. 21a bzw. V. 19b.

Dtn 20

16. Die Kriegsgesetze von Kapitel 20 folgen auf Bestimmungen über das gerichtliche Vorgehen bei Totschlag bzw. Mord (19,1-10.11-13) und über einen Rechtsstreit zweier Parteien (19,15.16-21), mit dem diese "vor Jahwe" treten (19,17). Nun ist nach altorientalischer Auffassung jeder Krieg eine Art Gottesgericht — ein Aspekt, der zum Beispiel die juristische Logik von 9,4-6 bestimmt. Deshalb kann der Text beim Übergang von Kapitel 19 zu Kapitel 20 vom menschlichen zum göttlichen Gericht hinüberassoziiieren. Die Gerichtsszene

(67) Die wichtigste Anordnung des Hauptfalls — "Du sollst drei Städten eine Sonderstellung zuweisen" — wird in V.2a und 7b stilistisch als Rahmen gebraucht. *bdl* hi. findet sich im dtn Gesetz nur an diesen beiden Stellen. Der Neueinsatz in V. 8 wird auch durch die Wiederholung von *gʿbûl* aus V. 3 und den offenbar bewußt unterschiedlich formulierten Landgabesatz markiert.

wirkt ferner zu Beginn von Kapitel 20 durch das "Vortreten" des Priesters weiter (20,2), denn *ngš ni.* ist im Dtn terminus technicus für das Erscheinen vor Gericht⁽⁶⁸⁾. Über das beiden Kapiteln gemeinsame Motiv "Gericht" hinaus dürften auch die Gesetze selbst grob aufeinander abgestimmt sein. Das gilt zunächst für die Reihenfolge der Gesetzesgruppen. Kapitel 19 beginnt mit zwei "Stadt"gesetzen (19,1-10.11-13). Nach einem Überleitungsparagraphen (19,14) handeln dann zwei Gesetze (19,15.16-21) von den bei einem Prozeß tätigen Personen. Kapitel 20 spricht im ersten Gesetz (20,1-9) über die beim Aufgebot des Volksheeres beschäftigten Personen. Daran schließen sich zwei "Stadt"gesetze an (20,10-18.19-20). Die Gesetze⁽⁶⁹⁾ sind also in lockerer Weise nach Orten und Personen chiastisch geordnet: Asylstädte (A) – Zeugen, Priester und Richter (B) – der Priester und die Listenführer (B') – belagerte Städte (A').

Zwischen einzelnen Gesetzen von Dtn 19 und 20 gibt es noch weitere thematische und formulierungsmäßig auffällige Gemeinsamkeiten. So verbindet das "Baumfällen" das erste und das letzte Stadtgesetz (19,1-10 und 20,19-20) und damit Anfang und Ende der beiden Kapitel: Die Wendungen *ndh ni. yād baggarzen* und *ndh q. garzen* finden sich im Dtn nur in 19,5 und 20,19, darüber hinaus ist *garzen* überhaupt nur noch zweimal im AT belegt⁽⁷⁰⁾; *krt (hā)'ēš* wird im Dtn bloß in 19,5 und 20,19.20 verwendet. Diese selten gebrauchten Ausdrücke machen es wahrscheinlich, daß durch sie die beiden Gesetzen bewußt aufeinander bezogen werden sollen. Zweitens sind das erste (19,1-10) und das vorletzte Stadtgesetz (20,10-18) durch den Satz *'āšer YHWH nōtēn l'kā (naḥālā)* miteinander verklammert. Er bezieht sich in 19,1.2.10 auf das Land der Völker bzw. Israels und in 20,16 auf die Städte der Völker⁽⁷¹⁾. Kapitel 19 und 20 pendeln also von der ersten Zeit der Landnahme und später der Vergrößerung des Gebietes Israels in die Zukunft mit ihren Institutionen von Asylstädten, (Zentral-)Gericht und Heerbann, und dann von Kriegen gegen Städte im Ausland wieder zurück in die Zeit der Er-

⁽⁶⁸⁾ *ngš ni.* ist im Dtn neben 20,2 noch in 21,5; 25,1.9 belegt.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Dabei bleibt 19,14 unberücksichtigt, was aber bei der großflächigen Struktur kaum ins Gewicht fällt.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ 1 Kön 6,7; Jes 10,15.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Auf den Krieg gegen Städte des Verheißungslandes geht nämlich nur 20,16-18 ein. Zu den Landsätzen s. auch Anm. 60.

oberung kanaanäischer Städte⁽⁷²⁾. Drittens werden in den Gesetzen, die Amtspersonen betreffen (19,15.16-21; 20,1-9), die sonst (16,18) zusammen auftretenden *šōpētim* und *šōṭerim* erst in der Gesamtheit dieser Gesetze, dann allerdings in der im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk üblichen Reihenfolge⁽⁷³⁾ vorgestellt: 19,17f erwähnt die Richter, 20,5.8 und 9 die Listenführer. Doch sprechen andererseits im ganzen Dtn nur 19,18 und 20,5-9 von ihrer spezifischen, von anderen Ämtern gesonderten Tätigkeit. Auch dieser Umstand läßt auf bewußtes Nebeneinander der Gesetze schließen.

17. Die drei Kriegsgesetze (Kapitel 20) werden untereinander durch leitmotivartige Wendungen vernetzt, die aus typischem Kriegsvokabular aufgebaut sind: aus den Nomina *milhāmā* und *ʾōyēbīm* sowie den Verben *lhm* ni. und *šwr*. Sie werden gezielt bei Struktureinschnitten eingesetzt⁽⁷⁴⁾. *yš' lammilhāmā 'al 'ōyēbēkā* (V. 1) eröffnet programmatisch die Gesetzesgruppe. Diese Wendung wird durch *qrb 'el hammilhāmā* (V. 2) für den Beginn der Schlacht präzisiert. Die Ansprache, die der Priester bei dieser Gelegenheit hält, wird von *qrb lammilhāmā 'al 'ōyēbēkem* (V. 3) und *lhm ni. 'im 'ōyēbēkem* (V. 4) gerahmt. Das zweite Gesetz (Krieg gegen eine feindliche Stadt) beginnt mit *qrb 'el 'ir lehillāhēm 'ālēhā* (V. 10). Schließlich findet sich *lehillāhēm 'ālēhā* nochmals am Anfang des dritten Gesetzes (V. 19). Hier (V. 19) wird auch der Präpositionalausdruck *'el 'ir* (vgl. V. 10) wieder verwendet. Er ist auch Teil eines anderen Systems, das im Abschnitt über die Belagerung und Einnahme einer feindlichen

(72) Zur Stellung von 20,19f s. u. 88.

(73) Vgl. Dtn 16,18; Jos 23,2; 24,1. In Jos 8,33 gilt *šōṭerim* wegen des fehlenden, vom Kontext aber geforderten Suffixes als Glosse — s. z. B. M. NOTH, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 1/7; Tübingen 1953) 50. Im Chronistischen Geschichtswerk ist die Reihenfolge umgekehrt: *šōṭerim wəšōpētim* — s. 1 Chr 23,4; 26,29.

(74) Struktureinschnitte werden in Kapitel 20 auch sonst durch gemeinsame oder einander ähnliche Formulierungen markiert. In V. 1-9 sind dies vor allem die gleichlautenden Einleitungen der Reden des Priesters (V. 2f) und der Listenführer (V. 5.8, vgl. V. 9): *dbr pi. 'el hā'am + 'mr. šālôm* am Ende von V. 10b wird von *šālôm* zu Beginn von V. 11a und *šlm hi.* zu Beginn von V. 12a aufgenommen. V. 15b schließt mit dem Präpositionalausdruck *me'ārē haggōyim hā'ēlleh*, V. 16a beginnt mit *mē'ārē hā'ammīm hā'ēlleh*. Ähnliches gilt auch von den Relativsätzen *'āšer nātan YHWH 'ēlohēkā lāk*, mit dem V. 14b die siegreiche Belagerung entfernter Städte beendet, und *'āšer YHWH 'ēlohēkā nōtēn lekā nahālā* in V. 16a zu Beginn des Kriegszuges gegen kanaanäische Städte.

Stadt im Zweiten Gesetz (V. 12-14) beginnt und diesen mit dem sachlich dazu gehörenden dritten Gesetz (V. 19-20) verbindet. Die beiden Wendungen *ʾšh ʾimmekā milhāmā* (A V. 12a) und *šwr ʾālèhā* (B V. 12b), die den Belagerungsabschnitt einleiten, rahmen in umgekehrter Abfolge — *šwr ʾel ʾîr* (B' V. 19a) und *ʾšh ʾimmekā milhāmā* (A V. 20b) — das dritte Gesetz, das der Kriegsführung während der Belagerung gewidmet ist. Die Elemente dieser Klammer sind also chiasmisch angeordnet. Auch das Ende des Abschnittes über die Stadtbelagerung (V. 14) wird mit dem dritten Gesetz verknüpft: Das im ganzen AT singuläre *ʾkl šʾlal ʾōybèkā* (V. 14) wird durch die Erlaubnis, während der Belagerung von den Bäumen der Stadt zu essen (*ʾkl* V. 19b), und im Verbot, ihren Fruchtbäumen (*ʿēš maʾākāl*) zu schaden (V. 20a), gewissermaßen wieder aufgenommen. Durch den Ausdruck (*šʾlal*) *ʾōybèkā* (V. 14) ist das Belagerungsende schließlich auch an den Beginn des ersten Gesetzes (V. 1.3.4) zurückgebunden.

Dieses erste Gesetz (V. 1-9) wird durch das für den Jahwekrieg gewichtige Motiv der Furchtlosigkeit gerahmt: Nur hier wird es gleich am Anfang (V. 1) als Prohibitiv *lōʾ tîrāʾ* und damit als für den Jahwekrieg grundsätzliches Verbot formuliert. Vor der Schlacht bilden die Vetitive *ʾal yērak ʾēbabkem ʾal tîrʾû* (V. 3) die ersten Mahnungen des Priesters. Noch zuletzt ist (*hāʾîš*) *hayyārēʾ wērak hallēbāb* (V. 8) die Sorge der Listenführer.

Dtn 20 entwickelt eine Theorie des Heeresaufgebots (V. 1-9) und der Kriegsführung (V. 10-18,19-20). Im Gesetz über das Volksheer (V. 1-9) sind die einzelnen Phasen — der Augenblick, in dem Israel den überlegenen Feind erblickt (V. 1), die Feldpredigt am Tag, an dem es zur Schlacht kommt (V. 2-4), die Ausmusterung der Soldaten samt der Einsetzung von Truppenführern (V. 5-8.9) — nach ihrer theologischen Bedeutung geordnet. Denn in Wirklichkeit folgen die genannten Akte ja umgekehrt aufeinander. Die vorliegende Systematisierung aber stellt alles vom Anfang her unter das Programm eines Jahwekrieges: "Du sollst dich nicht vor deinen Feinden fürchten, denn Jahwe, dein Gott, ist mit dir" (V. 1). Das Gesetz über den Krieg gegen feindliche Städte (V. 10-18) regelt zunächst die für die Adressaten aktuellen Kriegszüge gegen ausländische Städte (V. 10-15), setzt also die Landeseroberung als schon geschehen voraus. Erst danach geht das Gesetz auf den Krieg gegen Städte Kanaans ein (V. 16-18), der de facto bereits der Vergangenheit angehört. Vorrang hat also, was theologisch (V. 1-9) bzw. historisch wichtiger (V. 10-18) ist.

Weil das dritte Gesetz (V. 19-20) die strenge Logik der durchgespielten Möglichkeiten — Annahme der Unterwerfung (V. 11) bzw. Ablehnung (V. 12-18) durch eine ausländische (V. 12-15) oder inländische Stadt (V. 16-18) — unterbrechen würde, wird es trotz seiner zeitlichen Priorität erst am Ende angehängt. Es trägt zur Kriegsführung bei einer Belagerung (V. 12) die Schonung des Baumbestandes nach.

18. Selbst den Kriegsgesetzen von Dtn 20 geht es ebenso wie den übrigen Gesetzen im Bereich des 5. Dekaloggebotes darum, Leben zu bewahren. Schon die ersten drei Musterungsvorschriften (V. 5-7) sichern — sogar bei Gefährdung des Gemeinwesens und ohne daß familienrechtliche Motive genannt werden — das private Glück des einzelnen Soldaten. Ängstliche Menschen werden nach Hause geschickt, damit sie nicht die übrigen gefährden (V. 8). Bei einem Offensivkrieg muß einer Stadt außerhalb des eigenen Territoriums zunächst ein Friedensangebot gemacht werden (V. 10). Unterwirft sie sich nicht und wird sie besiegt, darf nur das allgemeine Kriegerrecht angewandt werden: Nur die Männer werden getötet, die Frauen, Kinder und Greise bleiben am Leben (V. 13-14). Auch ihre Fruchtbäume müssen erhalten und dürfen nicht zu Belagerungszwecken verbaut werden (V. 19-20). Dieser durchgehend humanen Grundtendenz widerspricht die grausame Vernichtungsweihe (V. 16-18) nicht. Sie ist streng auf die Landerobersituation und die Bewohner des verheißenen Landes beschränkt, ist also den eigentlichen Adressaten dieses Gesetzes ferne Vergangenheit und ihnen gerade nicht mehr gestattet⁽⁷⁵⁾.

19. Die Systematisierung der drei Kriegsgesetze unterscheidet sich von der Art, wie Gesetze bisher geordnet waren. Es muß hier offen bleiben, ob der Redaktor in diesem Fall bewußt eine andere Technik angewendet hat oder ob sie ihm schon mit dem Material vorgegeben war, das er übernommen und an dieser Stelle des dtn Kodex eingebaut hat.

Dtn 21

20. Kapitel 21 setzt thematisch sowohl den Bereich "Gericht" und damit Kapitel 19 als auch den Bereich "Krieg" und damit Ka-

⁽⁷⁵⁾ S. dazu N. LOHFINK, "חרם *ḥrm*", *TWAT* III 192-213, 209-212.

pitel 20 fort. Der redaktionelle Aspekt, der in Dtn 19–20 das menschliche mit dem göttlichen Gericht verbindet, prägt, wenn auch auf andere Art, besonders 21,1–9. Es regelt — sogar über mehrere Gesetze hinweg — den Gegenfall zu 19,1–13: für einen gewaltsam ums Leben Gebrachten läßt sich kein Totschläger oder Mörder ausfindig machen. Dort wie hier ist “unschuldig vergossenes Blut” (*dām nāqī* 19,10.13 und 21,9) nicht bloß Sache der Familie des Getöteten, sondern letztlich trägt ganz Israel dafür die Verantwortung. So üben die Ältesten Israels (21,2) und der Stadt, die dem Ermordeten am nächsten liegt (21,3.4.6 — vgl. 19,12), aber auch die Richter (21,2 — vgl. 19,17f) richterliche Funktionen aus. Schließlich treten sogar die Priester (zum Gericht) heran (*ngš ni* 21,5 — vgl. 19,17)⁽⁷⁶⁾. Das feierliche Bekenntnis, das die Ältesten ablegen (*’nh* 21,7), ist sowohl für das Gericht (vgl. 25,9) als auch für den Kult (vgl. 26,5) kennzeichnend (vgl. 27,14.15). Durch das Gebet (21,8) wird es zu einem juristisch-paraliturgischen Akt, wobei aber Jahwe allein entschuldigen, also die Blutschuld nicht anrechnen, kann. Mit der Gerichtsszene von Dtn 19 ist Kapitel 21 schließlich durch die Ausrotte-Formel (21,9.21a — vgl. 19,13.19) und die Abschreckungsformel (21,21b — vgl. 19,20) verbunden. An die Kriegssprache erinnern die in 21,1 gebrauchten Ausdrücke *hll* und *npl*⁽⁷⁷⁾. Sie passen gut zur Atmosphäre der Kriegsgesetze von Kapitel 20.

Formulierungsmäßig knüpft Kapitel 21 mit seinem ersten Gesetz (21,1–9) in 21,1 durch eine Landgabeformel an den Anfang von Kapitel 19 (19,1–2) an. Das “Feld” (*šādeh*) aber, auf dem der Umgebrachte nach 21,1 gefunden wird, schließt stichwortartig an das unmittelbar vorausgehende Gesetz am Ende von Kapitel 20 an, nämlich an das Verbot, die Bäume “auf dem Feld” wie Menschen zu fällen (20,19–20)⁽⁷⁸⁾. Das zweite Gesetz, über die Ehelichung einer Kriegsgefangenen (21,10–14), beginnt in 21,10a wortgleich mit 20,1a*: “Wenn du zum Kampf gegen deine Feinde ausziehst”, und führt dann 20,12–14 weiter (vgl. auch die Wendung “Jahwe, dein Gott, gibt in deine Hand” in 21,10b und 20,13). Das letzte Gesetz über die Bestattung eines Hingerichteten und dann am Pfahl Aufgehängten

⁽⁷⁶⁾ S. dazu S. 85f und Anm. 68.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ *hll* steht häufig für “mit dem Schwert durchbohren”, z. B. Num 19,16; zu *npl* vgl. Ri 9,40; 1 Sam 31,1; Ez 32,20.22.23.24.27.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Vgl. auch *yrd q.* bzw. *hi.*, die in Dtn 12–25 nur in 20,20 bzw. 21,4 belegt sind.

(21,22-23) klammert durch den Ausdruck *mišpaṭ māwet* an 19,6 zurück. Er ist im Dtn nur an diesen beiden Stellen belegt. Unmittelbar davor, in 19,5, findet sich auch das Stichwort "Baum" (*'ēš*), das ebenfalls in 20,22-23 verwendet wird. Es verbindet 21,22-23 außerdem mit 20,19-20. Anfang und Ende von Kapitel 21 hängen somit assoziativ am ersten Gesetz von Kapitel 19 und am letzten Gesetz von Kapitel 20.

21. Kapitel 21 geht es im ersten (21,1-9) und im letzten Gesetz (21,22-23) um die Reinerhaltung des Landes. Landgabesätze in 21,1 und 21,23 dienen dabei als Rahmen. Sie sind aber hier sachentsprechend mit *'ādāmā* konstruiert⁽⁷⁹⁾. Es wurde schon darauf hingewiesen, daß 21,1-9 ein Gegenstück zu den Gesetzen über die Asylstädte (19,1-10.11-13) bildet und 21,10-14 das Gesetz über die Belagerung einer entfernten Stadt weiterführt (20,12-14). Dagegen bilden die folgenden drei Gesetze eine neue, in sich geschlossene Gruppe. Sie leiten die Beschreibung des Tatbestandes mit *kī hyh le'îš / be'îš* ein (21,15.18.22) und hängen assoziativ am Thema Ehe und Familie, das 21,10-14 mit der Heirat einer Kriegsgefangenen schon angesprochen hat. Weil es durch eine solche Ehe am leichtesten zur Polygamie kam, sichert 21,15-17 das Erbrecht des Erstgeborenen einer Mehrehe. Sollte er der Sohn der weniger geliebten Frau sein — Anknüpfungspunkt ist die Frau, die nicht mehr gefällt in 21,14 —, darf er nicht verstoßen werden. Anders ein dauernd widersetzlicher Sohn: er ist nach 21,18-21 zu steinigen. Die drei Gesetze werden durch *kī hyh le'îš* bzw. *be'îš* (21,15.18 bzw. 22) eingeleitet, sind aber außerdem durch Leitwörter miteinander verklammert: "Frau" in 21,10-14 und 21,15-17, "Vater und Mutter" in 21,13 und 21,18-21, "Sohn" in 21,15-17 und 21,18-21. Die Exekution des störrischen Sohnes (21,21a) läßt in 21,22-23 zum Gesetz über die Bestattung des aufgehängten Leichnams eines Hingerichteten hinüberassoziiieren. Dabei können auch die vorausgehenden Motive der Entehrung (21,20) und Abschreckung (21,21b) mitschwingen.

22. Der Gesichtspunkt "Leben bewahren" bestimmt auch die Gesetze von Kapitel 21. Der in V. 1-9 vorgeschriebenen Prozedur geht es nicht um die Selbstrechtfertigung einer Stadt angesichts eines Getöteten, sondern um die Entsündigung von ganz Israel. Denn un-

⁽⁷⁹⁾ S. dazu auch Anm. 60. Innerhalb des Gesetzesblockes Dtn 19-25 findet sich ein Landgabesatz mit *'ādāmā* nur mehr in 25,15.

schuldig vergossenes und nicht gesühntes Blut würde ganz real seine erlöste Existenz gefährden (vgl. 19,13). V. 10-14 über die Heirat einer Kriegsgefangenen zeigt, daß auch in einer von Männern bestimmten Welt die Menschenwürde einer "erbeuteten" Frau geachtet werden muß. Sie ist kein sexuelles Freiwild für den Sieger, sondern muß wirklich geliebt und vor einem Geschlechtsverkehr voll in eine israelitische Familie integriert sein. V. 15-17 fixiert das Recht des Erstgeborenen zunächst einmal rein biologisch, also vom Gesichtspunkt der Zeugungs- und Lebenskraft aus. Diese Regelung verhindert aber auch, daß seine Mutter als weniger geliebte Frau nach dem Tod des Familienvaters benachteiligt werden kann. Im Unterschied zum altisraelitischen Recht (Ex 21,15.17) entscheidet nach V. 18-21 nicht mehr ein einmaliger Verstoß des Sohnes gegenüber seinen Eltern über seine Hinrichtung, sondern sein gesamtes Betragen. Außerdem ist jetzt das gemeinsame Vorgehen von Vater und Mutter Schritt für Schritt festgelegt, und es muß ein öffentlicher Prozeß stattfinden. Dadurch wird die Möglichkeit einer Exekution des Sohnes wesentlich eingeschränkt. Deshalb legt das Gesetz nicht das Elterngebot aus, sondern kommentiert das Tötungsverbot. V. 22-23 fordern, daß die Leiche eines gehenkten Verbrechers vom Pfahl abgenommen wird, damit sie nicht das Land verunreinigt und so Fruchtbarkeit und Leben beeinträchtigt⁽⁸⁰⁾.

23. Die letzten Gesetze, die der Redaktor dem Sachbereich des 5. Dekaloggebotes zugeordnet hat, stehen schon im Übergangstext 22,1-12 und werden dort mit Gesetzen aus dem Bereich des 6. Dekaloggebotes verschränkt. Ich habe ihre Abfolge bereits analysiert⁽⁸¹⁾ und werde in einem Fortsetzungsartikel (zur Gesetzesanordnung in Dtn 22–25) nochmals kurz darauf zurückkommen⁽⁸²⁾.

Institut für die alttestamentliche
Bibelwissenschaft
Kath.-Theol. Fakultät
Universität Wien Schottenring 21
A-1010 Wien

Georg BRAULIK

⁽⁸⁰⁾ S. dazu MERENDINO, *Gesetz*, 235 und 238.

⁽⁸¹⁾ BRAULIK, "Dekalog", 265-269.

⁽⁸²⁾ Ich danke N. Lohfink für seine kritische Lektüre des Manuskriptes.

SOMMAIRE

Cet article fait suite à celui de G. BRAULIK, "Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12-26 und der Dekalog". Il se sert de manière synchronique des indices de structure fournis par Dt 16,18-21,23 pour mettre en évidence les liens entre les lois particulières et leur arrangement ordonné. Une contribution à venir poursuivra la recherche pour Dt 22-25.

ANIMADVERSIONES

On Studying the Figures (*schēmata*) in the New Testament

Since the Hellenistic period two approaches have prevailed in the study of the figures⁽¹⁾ in the Greek NT. The first labels and classifies the figures according to the distinction between the figures of speech and the figures of thought. The second determines the functions of the figures by studying handbooks on rhetoric and style from that period⁽²⁾. The burning questions in these two approaches have always been: What do we technically call this or that figure and what is its proper definition? Is it a figure of speech or a figure of thought and what did the Auctor ad Herennium or Demetrius or Quintilian have to say about its function? After determining that it has an embellishing or emotive or accentuating function, the study of the figure was considered as having been completed.

Although the classification of figures and the study of their (mainly aesthetic) functions in Hellenistic textbooks are important, they are not the only or even proper ways of studying the figures in the NT. Questions about the possible text-strategical functions of the figures are far more weighty, but they have hardly been raised. The fact is, these really are the proper questions to ask, because the NT does not claim to be a piece of fine literature, but of argumentative and narrative discourse.

Chaim Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's treatment of rhetorical argumentation provides new ways to study the figures⁽³⁾. It is mainly their proposals that this essay will address. I first want to refer to the traditional ways in which the figures in the NT have been studied, namely by classifying them or by describing their functions (often with reference to Hellenistic text-

(1) The term "figures" is used to cover all those linguistic phenomena where language is used in an unusual way in order to yield a striking result. Rhetoricians mostly divided them into two main categories, namely the *schemata* and the *tropoi*. In his *Institutio Oratoria* IX 1, 1-9, for example, Quintilian made a special effort to distinguish between these two categories.

(2) The most important of these handbooks are: ARISTOTLE, *The Poetics* and *The Art of Rhetoric*; PSEUDO-LONGINUS, *On the Sublime*; DEMETRIUS, *On Style*; (CICERO), *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; and QUINTILIAN, *Institutio Oratoria*. All available in the LCL.

(3) C. PERELMAN and L. OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame-London 1969). A later condensation of this book is entitled *The Realm of Rhetoric* (Notre Dame-London 1982).

books). Following Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's proposals will be an evaluation of their contribution and a conclusion, in which this new way of studying the figures will be situated within the whole rhetorical enterprise⁽⁴⁾.

I. Traditional approaches to the study of the figures

1. *Classifications*

In the past, the most popular way of studying the figures has been to classify them according to the classical distinction between the various figures of speech and of thought. This approach is evident in the two standard grammars on the Greek NT by A. T. Robertson⁽⁵⁾ and Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf⁽⁶⁾. Both grammars distinguish between the grammatical or syntactical figures on the one hand and the so-called rhetorical figures on the other. The rhetorical figures are divided into figures of speech and figures of thought. These distinctions cause two main problems⁽⁷⁾:

i. The basis is not clear for a distinction between grammatical/syntactical figures and rhetorical figures, because most of the so-called rhetorical figures result from an unusual grammatical or syntactical arrangement.

ii. The distinction between the figures of speech and the figures of thought is a vague one⁽⁸⁾. Despite its vagueness, it forms the basis for the classification of the figures (next to the *tropes*) from the Hellenistic period to the works of R. Volkmann⁽⁹⁾, H. Lausberg⁽¹⁰⁾ and J. Martin⁽¹¹⁾. The grammarians of the Greek NT are thus part of a well-established tradition and not exceptions to the rule!

Owing to these problems, my colleague and I wrote an article in which

⁽⁴⁾ For this rhetorical enterprise, see G. A. KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill-London 1984).

⁽⁵⁾ A. T. ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville 1934).

⁽⁶⁾ BLASS-DEBRUNNER-REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen 1979).

⁽⁷⁾ See A. H. SNYMAN and J. v. W. CRONJÉ "Toward a new classification of the figures (*schēmata*) in the Greek New Testament", *NTS* 32 (1986) 113-121; and E. A. NIDA et al., *Style and Discourse, with special reference to the text of the Greek New Testament* (Cape Town 1983) 22-45 and 172-191.

⁽⁸⁾ The distinction first occurred in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a Hellenistic handbook from the first century B.C. According to H. CAPLAN, *Ad Herennium* (1977) 275, the line of demarcation between the figures of speech and the figures of thought was a vague one even in Hellenistic times.

⁽⁹⁾ R. VOLKMANN, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht* (Stuttgart 1885).

⁽¹⁰⁾ H. LAUSBERG, *Elemente der Literarischen Rhetorik* (München 1963; 1984).

⁽¹¹⁾ J. MARTIN, *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methodik* (München 1974).

other principles for the classification of the figures were proposed⁽¹²⁾. In this approach certain important figures were selected and classified according to the four principles of repetition, omission, a shift in expectancy and compactness⁽¹³⁾. This seems to be a step in the right direction, because it allows for both the formal and the functional aspects of the figures. It also breaks with the traditional distinction between the *schēmata lexeōs* and *schēmata dia-noias*. But it has the following two main defects:

i. "Function" here means the general communicative function of a figure, that is to say, how the figure contributes "to the effectiveness and acceptability of a text in terms of impact and appeal"⁽¹⁴⁾. It is assumed that a figure has a fixed definition and classification. *Hyperbole*, for instance, has to do with a contradiction in content and intent, and is defined as *Exaggeration*⁽¹⁵⁾. Critical questions are: Has a *hyperbole* always to do with such a contradiction? If so, in what way does it contribute to "the effectiveness and acceptability of a (specific) text in terms of impact and appeal"? These questions must receive attention in developing the functional aspect of the figures⁽¹⁶⁾.

ii. The figures — especially in Paul's letters — are seen as part of a literary object, with certain effects. As such they can be defined and classified, without reference to any specific context. It is against this way of studying the figures that Perelman rebels. According to him the use of a figure must be "explained by the requirements of argumentation"⁽¹⁷⁾. This significant remark endangers any classification of figures as being unnecessary. The remark especially applies to listings and classifications in works dealing with or referring to NT figures: Wilke⁽¹⁸⁾, Bullinger⁽¹⁹⁾, Quinn⁽²⁰⁾ (who also uses Biblical illustrations in his recent publication) etc. We all think we could study the figures by classifying them — whether justifying our classifications as linguistic or literary modes of expression. But in doing so, we may be evading the very heart of the matter. More on this in the discussion of Perelman's work.

⁽¹²⁾ SNYMAN and CRONJÉ, "Toward a new classification", 113-121.

⁽¹³⁾ See also NIDA et al., *Style and Discourse*, 23-45, 172-191.

⁽¹⁴⁾ NIDA et al., *Style and Discourse*, 23.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See NIDA et al., *Style and Discourse*, 185.

⁽¹⁶⁾ LAUSBERG, *Elemente*, 27, goes even further in speaking of the "Funk-tions-Typologie", i.e. the changes in the functional value of stylistic elements in different historical periods and cultures. Can we demonstrate such changes from one social milieu to another? A whole new field of research is opened by this question — a field of utmost importance to the study of the figures.

⁽¹⁷⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 168.

⁽¹⁸⁾ C. G. WILKE, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik. Ein Seitenstück zur Gram-matik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Dresden 1843).

⁽¹⁹⁾ E. W. BULLINGER, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible Explained and Il-lustrated* (London 1898. Reprinted Grand Rapids 1968). In the introduction to his book (VIII-IX), Bullinger refers to the most important attempts at labelling and classifying the Biblical figures up to the end of the nineteenth century.

⁽²⁰⁾ A. QUINN, *Figures of Speech. 60 Ways to Turn a Phrase* (Salt Lake City 1982).

2. The functions⁽²¹⁾ of the figures

The functions of the figures are far more important than their description and classification. This fact has led NT scholars to study the functions either through Hellenistic theorists or scholars in modern literary theory. In either case the figures are usually not analyzed in terms of any specific textual strategy.

Reflections on the functions of the figures are to be found in *grammars*, *monographs*, *articles* and *exegetical commentaries*⁽²²⁾.

Familiar functions such as emphasis, embellishment, perspicuity, liveliness and the evoking of emotions are listed in the grammars of Buttman⁽²³⁾, Green⁽²⁴⁾, Robertson⁽²⁵⁾ and Blass-Debrunner-Funk⁽²⁶⁾.

Two recent *monographs* deal extensively with the functions of the figures. Josef Zmijewski⁽²⁷⁾ has made a stylistic analysis of 2 Cor 11,1-12,10. It is a noncomparative study, in contrast to the dissertation of Aida B. Spencer⁽²⁸⁾, in which she presents a stylistic and historical comparison of 2 Cor 11,16-12,13, Rom 8,9-39 and Phil 3,2-4,13. Zmijewski's work evaluates Paul's stylistic skills for consistency, clarity, vividness, repetition and variation, appropriateness, dexterity, uniformity and trustworthiness. Various figures contribute to these characteristics of Paul's style. A figure is often integrated with the semantic content of a verse in describing its function. The five *isocolons* of 2 Cor 11,20 for instance, "zeigt in semantischer Hinsicht eine 'die Vollständigkeit überschreitende Fülle' an"⁽²⁹⁾. The parallel structure of the four *commata* of 2 Cor 11,23b "deutet darauf hin, dass hier wohl

(21) The various uses of the term "function" must be kept apart. In paragraph 1 the term refers to the communicative function of the figures, based on the relation of the parts of a text to one another and the relation of the text to the participants in the communication (NIDA et al., *Style and Discourse*). Perelman emphasizes the argumentative functions of the figures, while in this section (2) the term refers to the efforts of NT scholars to link the use of the figures with Hellenistic handbooks or modern theories of stylistic analysis.

(22) The book of BULLINGER, *Figures of Speech*, does not fit any of these categories. It has a lengthy list of figures used in the OT and NT, covering 1014 pages. The functions of all these figures are summarized in a single sentence: They are always used "for the purpose of giving additional force, more life, intensified feeling, and greater emphasis" (v-vi of the Introduction).

(23) BUTTMAN, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Andover 1878) 398-399.

(24) S. G. GREEN, *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (London 1912) 350-354.

(25) ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, par. 1198-1205.

(26) F. BLASS-A. DEBRUNNER-R. W. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago-London 1962) 240-262.

(27) J. ZMIJEWSKI, *Der Stil der paulinischen "Narrenrede". Analyse der Sprachgestaltung in 2 Kor 11,1-12,10 als Beitrag zur Methodik von Stiluntersuchungen neutestamentlicher Texte* (BBB 52; Köln-Bonn 1978).

(28) A. B. SPENCER, *Paul's Literary Style* (Mississippi 1984).

(29) ZMIJEWSKI, *Der Stil*, 207.

sachlich gleichrangige Aussagen gemacht werden sollen”⁽³⁰⁾. Such observations are of profound importance for exegesis, because the form is not separated from the content; the figures are not studied as purely formal devices, capable of producing certain aesthetic or other effects prescribed by Hellenistic handbooks.

Spencer’s comparative study of 2 Cor 11,16–12,13, Rom 8,9–39 and Phil 3,2–4,13 attempts to answer two questions: “Does the apostle Paul vary the style of his writing to assist communication to different communities? What characteristics of his writing remain constant?”⁽³¹⁾ In answering these questions she also considers the functions of the figures — especially in chapter 2, and in the second Appendix to her dissertation, where rhetorical terms are defined, examples provided and some of the effects listed. Unlike Zmijewski, Spencer refers frequently to Hellenistic handbooks for the functions of the figures. Thus repetitions like *pleonasm*, *anaphora*, *polysyndeton* etc. “give more of an effect of vividness than a single statement does” (according to Demetrius)⁽³²⁾. A metaphor gives “perspicuity, pleasure and a foreign air” (Aristotle), while both a metaphor and a *simile* can make style forcible (according to Demetrius)⁽³³⁾. Spencer provides the most complete account of possible functions of the figures to be found in Hellenistic handbooks, especially in Appendix II of her dissertation.

New ways of determining the functions of the figures were proposed in two recent *articles*. In “Style and meaning in Rm 8:31–39”⁽³⁴⁾, I followed the approach proposed in *Style and Discourse*. The figures are defined as signs, functioning in a semiotic system. As signs the figures have meaning for the receptors, because anything that serves as a sign of something else has meaning in the semiotic sense of the word. In determining the semiotic meanings of the figures in Rom 8,31–39, attention is paid “to the way in which the concepts and thoughts of a discourse are arranged on two levels: the macro- and the microlevel of rhetorical structure”⁽³⁵⁾. The macrolevel deals with the broader units of a discourse which are related semantically, while the rhetorical features (especially the figures) on the microlevel serve to relate units on the macrolevel or to increase their impact and appeal. These figures are studied as processes of repetition, omission and a shift in expectancies, because the process is regarded as the key to the semiotic meanings of the figures.

The figures mainly serve to mark two relations: the relationship of parts of the text to one another (which is essentially an aspect of cohesion), and the relation of the text to the reader. A meaning is not determined by one figure alone, because it is assumed that the variety of figures and their den-

⁽³⁰⁾ ZMIJEWSKI, *Der Stil*, 244.

⁽³¹⁾ SPENCER, *Paul’s Literary Style*, 5.

⁽³²⁾ SPENCER, *Paul’s Literary Style*, 35.

⁽³³⁾ SPENCER, *Paul’s Literary Style*, 46.

⁽³⁴⁾ A. H. SNYMAN, “Style and meaning in Romans 8:31–39”, *Neot* 18 (1984) 94–103.

⁽³⁵⁾ SNYMAN, “Style and meaning”, 95.

sity are important indicators of the way in which they mark the discourse. Apart from the cohesive function of the figures, however, they have no other functions than those listed in traditional grammars and in the monograph of Spencer. They may signal an association of the writer with his readers, tensions, emotions, etc.⁽³⁶⁾.

In an important article on the function of rhetorical questions in First Corinthians, W. Wuellner proposed yet another way of studying the functions of the figures in the NT⁽³⁷⁾. In determining these functions, he focuses on the coherence of Paul's letters and on the dynamics of argumentation, "both in its argumentatively 'convincing' and its 'persuasive' dimensions"⁽³⁸⁾. The purpose of the article is "to show that Paul's 'pastoral care' in 1 Corinthians which is directed at a specific church with its seemingly parochial and temporal problems is embedded in a care and pastoring of 'all the churches of God'"⁽³⁹⁾.

Referring to especially Perelman's treatment of rhetorical argumentation, Wuellner distinguishes four factors in determining the functions of rhetorical questions in 1 Corinthians: the framework of Paul's argumentation, the starting points of his argumentation, the techniques of argumentation and the sequence of arguments used. Every factor has important sub-divisions, and the four factors and their sub-divisions are illustrated by rhetorical questions which are used to emphasize, reflect or express them. Wuellner breaks with the traditional approaches to the study of the figures — approaches which he describes as "misleading" and purposefully tries to remedy. He succeeds in integrating the use of rhetorical questions with various important aspects of the process of argumentation — aspects such as the different types of audience addressed, the rhetorical situation, the evoking of concrete and abstract values serving as premises of rhetorical *sylogisms* or *enthymemes*, and the use of Perelman's dissociation-technique of argumentation. By using rhetorical questions in all these (and other) aspects of argumentation, Paul as pastor, as educator, i.e. as rhetorician, is guiding a maturing church, thereby "affecting society and culture"⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Figures and their functions seem to have little impact on scholars writing *exegetical commentaries* on the NT. A passage like Rm 8,31–39, for instance, is packed with rhetorical figures, which can contribute in various ways to its exegesis. Yet two leading commentators on Romans say little on the subject. O. Michel refers in a footnote to the questions in vv. 31–32, saying that Paul does not use them rhetorically here, because he repeats them in vv. 33 and 35. He continues: "Wichtig ist die Beobachtung, dass die paul. Fragestellung sich immer stärker zuspitzt. Das 'rhetorische' Element ist

⁽³⁶⁾ SNYMAN, "Style and meaning", 102.

⁽³⁷⁾ W. WUELLNER, "Paul as Pastor. The function of rhetorical questions in First Corinthians", *L'Apôtre Paul. Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère* (ed. A. VANHOYE) (BETL 73; Leuven 1986) 49–77.

⁽³⁸⁾ WUELLNER, "Paul as Pastor", 49.

⁽³⁹⁾ WUELLNER, "Paul as Pastor", 49–50.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ WUELLNER, "Paul as Pastor", 77.

nicht ganz zu übersehen, ist aber begrenzt" (41). Michel does not comment on any other figure in the passage. E. Käsemann on his part is interested in the characterization of the passage as a poem or a hymn or a doxology. He rejects all these possibilities: "Das Spiel von Frage und Antwort, Einwänden und deren Abweisung beweist, dass wieder christliche Diatribe mit einer Annäherung an antike Kunstprosa geboten wird" (42). On the possible functions of the questions and answers, or of any other figure used, Käsemann has no comments.

These examples will suffice as an overview of the subject. To summarize: It is clear that the few functions listed in grammars, monographs and articles, as well as the subjective way in which they are often determined, are valid reasons for Michel and other commentators' negative attitude towards the contribution of the figures to exegesis. Although they offer progressive developments in certain respects, the work of Zmijewski and the proposal in *Style and Discourse* still focus mainly on the text and its meaning. Wuellner's article makes a break from our exclusive preoccupation with Hellenistic works and the text as such. He is interested in the dynamics of argumentation and its relation to the social and cultural milieu. With this approach he is moving in the direction suggested by Perelman, that is, how the use of a figure can be explained by the requirements of the argumentation.

Perelman's proposals will be addressed in the remaining part of this essay.

II. Perelman and the study of the figures

The new rhetoric, as presented by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, endeavors to understand informal reasoning; "it includes all forms of argumentation, all the reasoning which Aristotle called dialectic, in opposition to the analytical reasonings, which formal logic studies" (43). Rhetoric has as its object "the study of discursive techniques functioning to provoke or increase the support of minds to the theses which one presents for approval" (44). In order to "increase the support of minds" the rhetorical figures play an important role: they are manifestations of the functions attributed to certain argumentative procedures or schemes (45). Without a full account of this argumentative role of the figures, Perelman regards their study as a useless pastime.

Remarks on the figures and their functions are scattered throughout Perelman's work. In order to get a grip on the material, I first want to pay

(41) O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament* (Göttingen 1955) 184.

(42) E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen 1974) 238.

(43) C. PERELMAN, "Rhetoric and Politics", *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 17:3 (1984) 129.

(44) PERELMAN, "Rhetoric and Politics", 129.

(45) PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 172.

attention to his definition of a figure. This will lead to his views on the classification of the figures, followed by an examination of the way in which the functions of the figures can be determined. The conclusion focuses on some new perspectives opened by Perelman and links his approach to a specific trend in modern literary scholarship.

1. *The definition of a figure*

In order that there may be a figure, the presence of two characteristics would seem essential: a discernible structure, independent of the content, in other words a form (which may, under the divisions recognized by modern logicians, be syntactic, semantic or pragmatic), and a use that is different from the normal manner of expression and, consequently, attracts attention. At least one of these requirements can be found in most of the definitions of figures that have been advanced over the centuries: the other is generally there indirectly⁽⁴⁶⁾.

To Perelman a structure, in order to be considered a figure, must have both characteristics: a discernible form and a use that is different from the normal. Especially the later is of paramount importance:

... there is a figure only when dissociation can be effected between the normal use of a structure and the use to which it is put in the speech, and when the hearer makes a distinction, which seems to him imperative, between form and substance. The whole of the argumentative significance of figures arises at the moment when this distinction, which was immediately noticed, is dissolved through the effect produced by the speech⁽⁴⁷⁾.

When can this distinction be made? What is normal use of a structure? For Perelman the "normal" is relative. An expression is normal in relation to a milieu, to an audience and to a specific moment in the discourse. This means that one cannot regard a structure as a figure without studying its use in a certain context⁽⁴⁸⁾. A figure is not something static; any structure is capable of becoming a figure, depending on the reaction of the audience. Perelman thus favours a more flexible approach to the study of the figures: he is convinced that full justice could only be done to the argumentative role of the figures "by the relativization of the normal"⁽⁴⁹⁾. The concepts of the milieu, the audience⁽⁵⁰⁾ and the point in a discourse are all important factors in identifying a figure.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 168.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 169.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ See again LAUSBERG on "Funktions-Typologie" in *Elemente*, par 46:2.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 171.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ For a discussion of Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's concept of the audience, both universal and particular, see M. W. DEMPSTER's doctoral dissertation at UCLA, entitled "Rhetorical Logic in Ethical Justification: A Critical exposition of Chaim Perelman's 'New Rhetoric' and its potential bearing on Christian moral reasoning" (Los Angeles 1980) 117-171.

Perelman's definition of a figure has far-reaching implications for the classification of the figures and for the determination of their functions.

2. *On the classification of the figures*

It is clear from the previous section (1) that it is not possible to determine in advance if a given literary structure is to be regarded as a figure or not. On the other hand, there are certain structures that are inclined to become figures and "have already attracted attention in the past"⁽⁵¹⁾. Perelman even refers to them by their traditional names. The fact that these structures exist, brings to the fore the question of their classification. On this point Perelman is quite clear:

... the customary classifications of figures cannot be of help to us. We believe, on the contrary, that the major distinction between figures of thought and figures of speech, which was unknown to Aristotle but has been apparently obligatory since the second century B.C., has helped to obscure the whole conception of rhetorical figures⁽⁵²⁾.

He is sceptical towards any classification, because in order to classify, a figure must be detached from its context. As such "it is almost necessarily perceived under its least argumentative aspect"⁽⁵³⁾. And this "argumentative aspect" is Perelman's main concern.

3. *The functions of the figures*

Perelman regards the figures as techniques of persuasive discourse. The important thing is not so much to study the figures in their totality, but "to show how and in what respects the use of particular figures is explained by the requirements of argumentation"⁽⁵⁴⁾. He rebels against two traditional ways of studying the figures. The first is to study them "as the art of good speaking and good writing, as an art of expressing thought, a purely formal art"⁽⁵⁵⁾; and second, to describe the effect of the figures or formal devices in terms not directly relevant to the argumentation. Certain forms of expression can have an aesthetic effect. They can provoke admiration or cause a rise and fall of attention. These effects are well-known, but they are not analyzed in terms of the argumentation. Therefore, although important, Perelman prefers not to deal with them in his study of the functions of the figures.

Perelman thus makes a sharp distinction between figures that have an aesthetic function, that is, figures merely acting on the feelings of the au-

⁽⁵¹⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 171. By the same token it can go in reverse (to complete their line of thought): What in a certain genre at a certain period is liable to become a figure can (in another genre and period) fall back to a purely aesthetic object again.

⁽⁵²⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 171-172.

⁽⁵³⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 171.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 168.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 142.

dience, and figures with an argumentative function. He is only interested in the last category⁽⁵⁶⁾. It is not possible to determine beforehand if a figure will have an argumentative or an aesthetic (stylistic) function. When the figure is used in a context, however, the distinction becomes evident:

Forms which seem at first to be used in an unusual manner may come to appear normal if their use is justified by the speech taken as a whole. We consider a figure to be *argumentative* if it brings about a change of perspective, and its use seems normal in relation to this new situation. If, on the other hand, the speech does not bring about the adherence of the hearer to this argumentative form, the figure will be considered as embellishment, a figure of style. It can excite admiration, but this will be on the aesthetic plane, or in recognition of the speaker's originality⁽⁵⁷⁾.

How can one then determine the functions of the figures? This is a difficult task, because a figure does not always have the same function in argumentation. The figures are best studied as possible manifestations of the functions attributed to argumentative procedures. These functions would be either starting-points or techniques of argumentation. This means that figures may not productively be studied in isolation, as an end in themselves. They are to be discussed in connection with a particular argumentative procedure or scheme, in order to inquire which of them are of such a nature as to fulfill the functions attributed to that procedure.

This approach then examines the figures under the various argumentative procedures discussed in *The New Rhetoric*. *Hyperbole* and *litotes*, for instance, are discussed under *Argumentation based on the structure of reality* (*Subdivision: Liaisons of succession*)⁽⁵⁸⁾, because they serve the purpose of unlimited development⁽⁵⁹⁾. Personification, *apostrophe* and *prosopopoeia* fall under the same argumentative procedure, *Subdivision: Liaisons of coexistence*⁽⁶⁰⁾, because they "establish a tie between realities on unequal levels; one is shown to be the expression or manifestation of the other"⁽⁶¹⁾. *Metonymy* is also a manifestation of *Argumentation based on the structure of reality*, *Subdivision: Symbolic Liaisons*, because it can be regarded as a symbol, giving "presence to what it symbolized"⁽⁶²⁾. Figures like *paradoxism* and *oxymoron* are part of the argumentative procedure of dissociation, because

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Perelman refers to the first category only marginally. Formal stylistic devices with an aesthetic function, however, still have a function, and a discussion of these functions would certainly have added to the significance of his work.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 169.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 89. No changes with regard to the figures have been made in this later and concise edition of *The New Rhetoric*. The two works can thus be quoted interchangeably.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 290.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 101.

⁽⁶¹⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 89-90.

⁽⁶²⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 102.

they call for an effort at dissociation: "Every time an adjective or verb which seems incompatible is attached to a noun (learned ignorance, happy misfortune, bitter joy, thinking the unthinkable, expressing the unexpressible, the conditions of unconditional surrender), only a dissociation makes it possible to understand the expression"⁽⁶³⁾.

Under the heading *Fullness of Argumentation and Strength of Arguments*, Perelman discusses figures like *amplification* and *praeteritio*. Fullness may be the result of repetition, of an amplification of a single argument. It emphasizes, thereby giving presence to the argument. On the other hand an argument may only be alluded to without it being fully developed. Figures like *praeteritio* or reticence "refer to this technique wherein one is content to allude to an argument, but to leave its development to the audience's imagination"⁽⁶⁴⁾.

As a result of Perelman's treatment of the figures, examples of a certain figure occur under more than one argumentative scheme. *Litotes* as a figure of unlimited development, for instance, is discussed under *Argumentation based on the structure of reality*; yet it can also be a technique of restraint in so far as the speaker or writer expects that it will be interpreted as an attempt at moderation: "All the techniques of restraint give a favorable impression of sincerity and balanced judgment and help to dispel the idea that argumentation is a device, a trick"⁽⁶⁵⁾. The way in which *litotes* functions in these two argumentative schemes differs considerably. Examples like these prove the value of Perelman's dismembering of the figures: their dismembering best conveys their argumentative significance.

Not only can one figure be the manifestation of more than one argumentative procedure, but more than one figure can also have a single effect in argumentation. This becomes clear in Perelman's discussion of the figures relating to *choice*, *presence* and *communion*. He is quick to add that "these terms do not represent families in which certain traditional figures appear as members. They simply indicate that the effect or one of the effects certain figures have in the presentation of data is to impose or to suggest a choice, to increase the impression of presence, or to bring about communion with the audience"⁽⁶⁶⁾.

Figures relating to *choice* are oratorical definition, *periphrasis*, *synecdoche* or *metonymy*, *antonomasia*, *prolepsis*, *reprehensio* and *correctio*. The argumentative role of each figure is determined from the context, but they all work on the assumption that argumentatively valid reasons exist for choosing one form of expression over the other. *Antonomasia*, for instance, can be defined as a kind of *synecdoche* which consists of using a proper name for a common name or vice versa. Use of a common name instead of a proper name, may be intended to avoid the use of the proper name, or to describe someone in such a way as to help the argument. *Prolepsis*, to mention one

⁽⁶³⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 443.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 144.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 446.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 172.

more example, is anticipation; it may be a figure of choice "when its aim is to hint that there are grounds for substituting one qualification for another that might have raised objections"⁽⁶⁷⁾. Grounds for substitution must be determined from the literary and social context.

Presence is the second important factor in all argumentation. It is often created by the use of figures: "To create presence it is useful to insist at length upon certain elements: in prolonging the attention given them, their presence in the consciousness of the audience is increased"⁽⁶⁸⁾. The usual figures for intensifying the feeling of presence are forms of repetition such as *anaphora* and *conduplicatio*; also *amplificatio*, *aggregatio*, *synonymy* (*metabole*), *hypotyposis*, *enallage* of tense, etc. Repetition, for example, may create presence because it breaks up a unit into separate parts, thus acting directly on our sensibility. But repetition has a more complex argumentative function than just creating presence: it aims at suggesting distinctions, at increasing the weight of the successive terms used⁽⁶⁹⁾. In this way the effect of presence is subordinated to other ends. A figure that creates a strong feeling of presence, is the last one mentioned above: *enallage* of tense. Perelman uses the example: "If you speak you *are* dead". The future is replaced by the present, thereby suggesting "that the consequence of disobeying the injunction will be instantaneous"⁽⁷⁰⁾.

Communion with the audience is brought about by figures like allusion, *apostrophe*, oratorical question and *enallage* of person. In allusion the author deliberately refers to some event, custom or cultural fact without naming it. The interpretation must be completed by an audience who is aware of the thing referred to and with whom the author is trying to establish communion. The thing alluded to is usually strongly relevant to author and audience, and this increases the communion between the two. Another figure, *enallage* of person, is referred to by Pseudo-Longinus as one "in which 'I' or 'he' is replaced by 'thou', making 'the hearer' imagine he sees himself in the midst of the danger"⁽⁷¹⁾. It is a figure of communion, but also of presence — another example of how one figure has more than one function.

These examples point out the connection Perelman sees between certain figures and the theory of argumentation. He subordinates the study of the figures to his study of argumentation, and regards the figures as manifestations of the functions of the various argumentative procedures.

4. Evaluation

Perelman strongly opposes traditional ways of studying the figures, because they represent the reduction of rhetoric to a theory of figures of style,

⁽⁶⁷⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 174.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 37.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 175.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 177.

⁽⁷¹⁾ PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric*, 178.

of ornate language⁽⁷²⁾. This reduction is the reason for the contempt into which rhetoric fell in the previous century and the first half of this one⁽⁷³⁾. In his attempt to rescue rhetoric from this fatal reduction, he also suggests new ways of studying the figures.

Two aspects of this new approach are of utmost importance. The first is Perelman's focus on the dynamics of argumentation, on the use of the figures as techniques of argumentation and persuasion. The figures are not considered as art forms, contributing to a certain kind of literature; they are not studied as literary forms, but as processes of argumentation and persuasion. With this focus Perelman is in the company of those scholars interested in how a text functions: Edwin Black⁽⁷⁴⁾, N. Frye⁽⁷⁵⁾ and Wayne Booth⁽⁷⁶⁾.

A second important aspect of Perelman's approach is his emphasis on the role of the audience in determining the argumentative functions of the figures. The role of the audience is indispensable in determining whether the use of a structure is normal, that is, whether it can be regarded as a figure or not. But the audience is not constant, with the result that the *status* of a figure cannot be fixed in advance⁽⁷⁷⁾. Furthermore: the audience is indispensable in determining the *function* of a figure. Various figures, for instance, are analyzed as a means of increasing the feeling of presence in the audience. Presence is thus determined directly in relation to the audience⁽⁷⁸⁾.

An objection may be raised as to the validity of a psychological notion like "presence" in determining the functions of argumentative figures. Perelman is not interested in psychology as an end in itself; he is interested in the ways psychology is used to create "presence". It is by prolonged attention given to certain elements that "their presence in the consciousness of the audience is increased"⁽⁷⁹⁾. By dwelling on them longer than on other ele-

⁽⁷²⁾ Other scholars also share Perelman's opposition to this reduction of rhetoric to figures of style. W. Booth is of the opinion that one of the obvious perversions of rhetoric "has been the multiplication of charts and lists of these tropes and figures, letting the 'structures' obscure the purposes for which they are constructed". ("Rhetorical Critics Old and New: the Case of Gerard Genette", *Reconstructing Literature* [ed. L. LERNER] [Oxford 1983] 132). Booth also refers to Genette's famous essay of 1982, "Rhetoric Restrained", in which Genette "traces the curious narrowing of the domain of rhetoric through the centuries since Descartes, in ways similar to those one finds in the works of Chaim Perelman, or in Richard McKeon's accounts of the decline of rhetorical studies" ("Rhetorical Critics", 133).

⁽⁷³⁾ PERELMAN, "Rhetoric and Politics", 129.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ E. BLACK, *Rhetorical Criticism. A Study in Method* (New York 1965).

⁽⁷⁵⁾ N. FRYE, *The Great Code* (New York 1981) 28-29.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ W. BOOTH, "Rhetorical Critics", 136-137.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ On the flexibility of audiences and environmental conventions, see also E. BLACK, "The Mutability of Rhetoric", *Rhetoric in Transition* (ed. E. E. WHITE) (Pennsylvania 1980) 82; J. KUGEL, "On the Bible and Literary Criticism", *Proof-texts* 1:3 (1981) 229.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ For a discussion of the creation of presence in the minds of the audience, see DEMPSTER, "Rhetorical Logic in Ethical Justification", 172-187.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ PERELMAN, *The Realm*, 37.

ments, they are endowed with a presence in the minds of the hearers. Perelman is not interested in the internal structure and functioning of the mind as such.

Conclusion

Three universal factors are usually distinguished in any communication: a speaker (writer), a discourse and an audience. These three factors are also operative in any rhetorical situation⁽⁸⁰⁾, and they correspond to the three modes of artistic proof identified by Aristotle: *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos*. According to Kennedy, *ethos* refers to "the credibility that the author or speaker is able to establish in his work"⁽⁸¹⁾. *Logos* has to do with the argument, the logical argumentation in a discourse, while *pathos* resides with the audience and refers to the emotional reactions of the hearers⁽⁸²⁾.

The most important universal factor, however, is context. Beyond the speaker (*ethos*), beyond the discourse (*logos*) and beyond the audience (*pathos*) there is always a milieu, a context. This context is somewhat related to the rhetorical situation, the framework within which all of us move. It is the context (social, cultural, rhetorical, etc.) which shapes the speaker, which determines the arrangement of the material and the use of rhetorical figures, and which explains the reaction of the audience. Context is thus the common denominator: *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos* are determined by their contextual function.

These four factors did not receive equal attention in the study of the figures of the NT. In most studies the figures are regarded as formal devices, either classified or considered capable of creating some kind of *pathos* in the audience. In others the interest is directed to the role of the figures in establishing Paul's *ethos*, in describing his ability to use the figures in an appropriate way and comparing his literary skills with Judaistic or Hellenistic sources. These types of studies also show an interest in historical questions such as the origins of Paul's rhetorical training⁽⁸³⁾. Up to now little attention was paid to the *logos* function of the figures and to the important universal factor of the context.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ See R. L. SCOTT, "A Synoptic View of Systems of Western Rhetoric", *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61:4 (1975) 440: "... rhetoric is communication characterized by a high degree of intentionality and a high degree of structure, including distinctness of communicative roles; ... in the late twentieth century it is important to picture rhetoric as one of several sorts of communication".

⁽⁸¹⁾ KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation*, 15.

⁽⁸²⁾ See KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation*, 15. According to D. EHNINGER in his response to the above-mentioned article of R. L. Scott in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 452-453: "... rhetoric informs all human communicative activity... (we must learn) to accept on their own grounds the whole range of appeals which rhetoric embraces — those addressed to the imagination and feelings as well as those addressed to reason".

⁽⁸³⁾ For this approach, see *inter alia* E. NORDEN, *Die Antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance II* (Stuttgart 1958).

Perelman's new rhetoric attempts to revive interest in the figures as important techniques in all argumentation⁽⁸⁴⁾. The argumentative role played by these figures in fulfilling the functions attributed to certain argumentative procedures and in making certain elements of the discourse present to the minds of the hearers, move these figures beyond mere examples of eloquence. It makes them elements in practical reasoning, techniques of argumentation. Although concerned with extra-biblical discourse, his proposals are just as applicable to the Greek NT as to any other form of literary communication. They represent a viable way out of the *impasse* in which traditional studies of the figures in the NT have driven us.

University of the Orange Free State
P.O. Box 339
9300 Bloemfontein
Republic of South Africa

Andreas H. SNYMAN

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Perelman does not question the importance of the "stylistic" figures and their aesthetic and other functions in oratorical practice, but states that they are irrelevant to his study of argumentation (*The New Rhetoric*, 143). It would, however, have added to the significance of his contribution if he had paid more attention to the *ethos* and *pathos* parts of the rhetorical process.

La portée de διὰ τοῦτο en He 9,15

L'épître aux Hébreux est le seul écrit du NT qui attribue au Christ le titre important de «médiateur d'une alliance nouvelle» (9,15; 12,24; cf. 8,6). Juste après son exposé sur la supériorité du sacrifice du Christ sur les sacrifices anciens (9,11-14), l'auteur déclare en 9,15: Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως, θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. Pour préciser l'idée de l'activité médiatrice du Christ, il est nécessaire de déterminer d'abord à quoi exactement l'expression initiale καὶ διὰ τοῦτο se rapporte: au verset précédent, faisant ainsi apparaître le sacrifice du Christ comme le fondement de sa médiation, ou bien à la proposition finale qui suit (ὅπως...), accentuant donc plutôt la finalité de la médiation?

1. Une analogie peu convaincante: Xén. Cyrop. ii.1.21

La plupart des auteurs⁽¹⁾ s'accordent pour dire que διὰ τοῦτο se rapporte à ce qui précède, sans pourtant être unanimes à décider s'il s'agit du seul v. 14 (Delitzsch, Weiss, Westcott, Hollmann, Seeberg, Riggenbach, Montefiore, Braun), ou du v. 12 (par ex. St Thomas d'Aquin, Hofmann), ou des vv. 11-14 (Lünemann), ou de «tout ce qui précède» (sans précision ultérieure: Grosheide).

Une minorité de commentateurs⁽²⁾, au contraire, soutient que διὰ τοῦτο se rapporte à la préposition finale introduite par ὅπως. (Quant à O. Michel, tout en admettant les deux possibilités au niveau grammatical, il ne semble pas préciser sa propre position).

Parmi les arguments, par ailleurs très peu consistants, proposés en faveur de cette dernière interprétation, dans le commentaire de Moffatt on trouve une allusion à Xén. Cyrop. ii.1.21, reprise après lui par Héring et Spicq, en guise d'exemple prouvant que διὰ τοῦτο en He 9,15 doit se rapporter à ὅπως κτλ. Étant donnée l'importance attribuée à ce texte pour décider de l'interprétation de διὰ τοῦτο en He 9,15, il nous semble intéressant de l'examiner de près: ὥστε εὐθὺς αὐτῶν παρεσκεύασε τὰς γνώμας ὡς ὁμόσε ἰτέον εἶη τοῖς

(1) Lünemann, Delitzsch, Hofmann, Weiss, Westcott, Hollmann, Seeberg, Riggenbach, Bonsirven, Grosheide, Bruce, Montefiore, Strobel, Braun, dans leurs commentaires respectifs de l'épître aux Hébreux.

(2) Bleek, Windisch, Lenski, Moffatt, Héring, Kuss, Spicq.

πολεμίοις, ἡ ὁμολογητέον μηδενὸς εἶναι ἀξίους συμμάχους· τοῦτο δὲ χαλεπὸν ὁμολογήσαι οἵτινες ἂν εἰδῶσιν ὅτι οὐδὲ δι' ἑν ἄλλο τρέφονται ἢ ὅπως μαχῶνται ὑπὲρ τῶν τρεφόντων. «Ainsi, tout de suite, il les prépara à l'idée qu'il leur faudrait en venir aux mains avec l'ennemi ou convenir qu'ils étaient des alliés dont il n'y avait rien à attendre, aveu pénible pour ceux qui savent que, s'ils sont nourris, c'est uniquement afin de combattre pour qui les nourrit»⁽³⁾.

Dans ce texte, il y a une relation grammaticale explicite et incontestable entre δι' ἑν et ὅπως, au moyen d'ἄλλο... ἢ.

Parmi les commentateurs de He que nous avons pu consulter, le premier à citer ce texte de Xénophon est Delitzsch⁽⁴⁾, réagissant à un raisonnement, selon lui erroné, de Hofmann. Ce dernier rapporte διὰ τοῦτο en He 9,15 à ce qui précède (position partagée par Delitzsch), mais en disant que si l'auteur de He avait voulu rapporter διὰ τοῦτο à ce qui *suit*, il aurait utilisé la construction διὰ τοῦτο... ἵνα (cf. 2 Co 13,10; 1 Tm 1,16; Phm 15), et non pas διὰ τοῦτο... ὅπως. Introduisant le texte de Xénophon, Delitzsch veut démontrer que cet argument de Hofmann n'est pas en soi suffisant, car grammaticalement il est possible que διὰ soit renforcé par ὅπως, comme c'est justement le cas dans l'exemple cité. Très probablement à la suite d'un malentendu, Moffatt et Spicq après lui⁽⁵⁾ emploient le même texte comme un exemple prouvant que dans une construction διὰ τοῦτο... ὅπως, διὰ τοῦτο se rapporte *nécessairement* à la proposition introduite par ὅπως.

En plus, Spicq donne explicitement une construction étrange en He 9,15, en parlant de ὅπως... εἰς: «Si le Christ en est le médiateur (viii,6) et réalise cette prophétie, ce ne peut être qu'avec la mission d'accomplir ce rachat (ὅπως... εἰς renforcé par διὰ τοῦτο; cf. Xénophon, Cyr. ii,1,21) qui vise les transgresseurs de l'ancienne alliance, c'est-à-dire notamment les lecteurs de l'épître avant leur conversion»⁽⁶⁾. A la base de son exégèse, on peut suspecter Moffatt d'avoir à l'esprit une construction semblable⁽⁷⁾.

⁽³⁾ Traduction française prise de Xénophon, *Cyropédie*. Texte établi et traduit par M. Bizos (Collection des Universités de France, Association G. Budé; Paris 1971).

⁽⁴⁾ F. DELITZSCH, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, vol. II. (Edinburgh 1870) 99, n. 1. Nous n'avons pas eu à notre disposition l'édition originale allemande correspondante à celle-ci.

⁽⁵⁾ Nous n'avons aucune preuve positive de ce que Moffatt et Spicq aient emprunté ce texte de Xénophon au commentaire de Delitzsch, puisqu'ils ne le citent pas en ce lieu. Toutefois, il nous semble légitime de le supposer, étant donnée l'habitude des auteurs de se servir des textes secondaires donnés comme exemples par d'autres commentateurs, sans l'obligation de se référer explicitement à ces derniers.

⁽⁶⁾ C. SPICQ, *L'épître aux Hébreux* (EBib; Paris 1953) 261.

⁽⁷⁾ J. MOFFATT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh 1924) 126: «As the climax of the promises in the new διαθήκη is pardon (8,12), so here its purpose is described as ἀπολύτρωσις». En réalité, le but de la διαθήκη nouvelle en 9,15 n'est pas l'ἀπολύτρωσις (ce qui suppose une construction ὅπως... εἰς), mais l'accès à la κληρονομία: la seule construction grammaticalement correcte et possible est ὅπως... τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν.

L'emploi de Xén. Cyrop. ii.1.21 comme seul argument en He 9,15 en faveur d'une construction où διὰ τοῦτο se rapporterait à la proposition finale qui suit, est contestable pour différentes raisons.

D'abord, nous avons vu que Delitzsch le propose simplement comme une possibilité grammaticale, nullement comme interprétation contraignante pour He 9,15. Or, Moffatt et Spicq, s'ils ont pris la citation à la suite de Delitzsch, comme nous le supposons, n'en ont manifestement pas saisi la portée exacte.

En plus, ils ignorent aussi la grande différence qui existe entre la construction de He 9,15 et celle de la phrase de Xénophon. En He 9,15, il y a deux possibilités grammaticales, tandis que le texte de Xénophon ne laisse aucun doute sur la construction: dans cette phrase, en effet, il y a un rapport syntaxique explicite entre δι' ἐν et ὅπως, au moyen de l'expression ἄλλος ἤ; en He 9,15, au contraire, il n'y a pas de lien syntaxique explicite. Il n'est donc pas justifié de pousser l'analogie avec Xén. Cyrop. jusqu'à en déduire une interprétation exclusive pour He 9,15.

La fonction de διὰ τοῦτο restant ainsi ambiguë du point de vue grammatical, il faut chercher une solution plutôt du côté du contexte de ce verset. Or, il est significatif que beaucoup d'auteurs parmi ceux qui favorisent une construction διὰ τοῦτο... ὅπως en Hébreux, ne trouvent pas de lien logico-thématique entre le v. 15 et ce qui précède, notamment quant au thème du sacrifice. Ce fait, nous allons le voir, est largement dû à la méconnaissance de la structure littéraire de l'épître. La considération de la structure, au contraire, se révélera un moyen efficace pour mieux saisir le lien non seulement entre les vv. 14 et 15, mais encore entre les subdivisions dont les deux versets font partie. Elle facilitera par conséquent une juste appréciation du rôle de διὰ τοῦτο, et finalement de la notion de médiation du Christ.

2. L'apport de la structure littéraire⁽⁸⁾

Certains éléments, comme par ex. la particule initiale καί et l'absence d'un sujet explicite dans le v. 15, indiquent au niveau grammatical qu'en 9,14-15 l'auteur de He veut mettre un rapport explicite entre le sacrifice du Christ, différent et plus efficace du sacrifice ancien (v. 14), et la nouvelle alliance (v. 15). En vue de préciser ce rapport, il faut situer les deux versets tant dans l'ensemble de l'épître que dans leur contexte immédiat.

La position des deux phrases est significative: elles se trouvent dans la partie centrale de l'épître, précisément dans la section centrale (8,1-9,28) qui, à son tour, se divise en deux paragraphes. Un regard sur la composition des deux paragraphes est très instructif, car il révèle que deux thèmes importants, celui du culte et celui de l'alliance, s'entrelacent constamment: le lien auquel on a fait allusion plus haut, entre les deux thèmes en nos versets n'est donc pas casuel⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ Nous suivons la structure proposée par A. VANHOYE, *La structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux* (Paris 1976).

⁽⁹⁾ Le schéma utilisé ici est pris de A. VANHOYE, *Prêtres anciens, prêtre nouveau selon le Nouveau Testament* (Parole de Dieu; Paris 1980) 197.

I	A)	Niveau du culte	8,3-6	phase centrale de la médiation
	B)	Question de l'alliance	8,7-13	phase descendante de la médiation
	C)	Description du culte ancien	9,1-10	phase ascendante de la médiation
II	C')	Description du culte du X ^e	9,11-14	phase ascendante de la médiation
	B')	Fondation de l'alliance	9,15-23	phase descendante de la médiation
	A')	Niveau final du culte	9,24-28	phase centrale de la médiation

De plus, un examen attentif de la structure fait comprendre que l'auteur considère la relation entre culte et alliance sous un aspect très particulier, qui est celui de la médiation sacerdotale. Le schéma de cette dernière comprend trois étapes: la première en est la phase ascendante, c'est-à-dire le sacrifice, au moyen duquel le prêtre cherche à s'élever jusqu'à Dieu. Elle est peut-être la phase la plus importante, parce qu'elle détermine la réussite même de l'entreprise. Du point de vue logique, le second élément est la phase centrale: grâce au sacrifice, le prêtre est accueilli auprès de Dieu, au cas où le mouvement ascendant a été efficace. Enfin, la phase descendante manifesterait le résultat de la médiation sacrificielle: elle communique la bénédiction ou la faveur demandée.

Dans la section centrale de He, deux des six paragraphes, chaque fois, correspondent à l'une des trois phases ici décrites, toutefois pas dans l'ordre logique normalement attendu. La position centrale aussi bien que l'extension de la phase ascendante de la médiation témoignent de la grande importance que l'auteur lui attribue, en la développant dans les paragraphes C (9,1-10) et C' (9,11-14).

La différence de qualité de la διαθήκη (B et B') est étroitement liée à l'efficacité du culte. Les sacrifices anciens se sont révélés incapables de réellement atteindre Dieu et de transformer l'homme intérieurement, d'où le caractère instable du résultat atteint. L'offrande du Christ, tellement supérieure aux sacrifices anciens et animée par la force ascensionnelle de l'Esprit, se révèle agréée par Dieu, elle est capable de transformer l'homme et de lui donner une relation stable avec Dieu, fondée sur le pardon.

Il ne suffit donc pas de remarquer que les deux versets qui nous intéressent font partie de deux subdivisions distinctes, mais en plus il faut souligner que ces subdivisions correspondent à deux phases distinctes de l'activité médiatrice du Christ: le v. 14 décrit la phase ascendante, tandis que le v. 15 commence la description de la phase descendante. Or, déjà à partir de 7,12.18-19 il était clair que, pour l'auteur, le changement de sacerdoce, de culte, a comme conséquence nécessaire un changement en d'autres secteurs (dans le chapitre 7, il parle de la Loi). L'insistance en 9,11-14 sur la qualité différente du sacrifice prépare, selon cette perspective, une assertion sur la qualité proportionnellement différente du résultat atteint, cette fois-ci par rapport à la διαθήκη.

Le lien logique très fort établi par l'auteur entre les deux sections, précisément du point de vue de la médiation, est donc susceptible de nous aider à discerner pourquoi et en quel sens le Christ est dit διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης dans le v. 15. Et ce discernement se fait précisément en interprétant la fonction du διὰ τοῦτο, à la lumière de ce que la structure littéraire vient de nous apprendre. Celui-ci, dans la perspective de l'auteur, ne peut se rapporter qu'au verset précédent, c'est-à-dire à la phrase qui affirme la supériorité du sacrifice du Christ sur les sacrifices anciens. Précisément à cause de ce sacrifice supérieur (v. 14), διὰ τοῦτο, le Christ est médiateur d'une alliance nouvelle (v. 15), le caractère de nouveauté totale étant assuré par la supériorité de l'offrande. Cette interprétation a l'avantage d'être cohérente avec la pensée théologique de l'auteur exprimée dans l'ensemble de l'épître, et permet de préciser que la médiation christique d'une alliance nouvelle est bien une médiation sacerdotale, effectuée au moyen d'un sacrifice.

Conclusion

Nous avons abordé l'interprétation de διὰ τοῦτο en He 9,15 en deux étapes, afin de pouvoir, ensuite, préciser la conception que l'auteur se fait de la médiation du Christ.

Premièrement, nous avons examiné le texte de Xén. Cyrop. ii.1.21, proposé par quelques commentateurs d'Hébreux pour soutenir en He 9,15 une construction διὰ τοῦτο... ὅπως. Nous croyons avoir montré que l'analogie entre les deux textes n'est pas complète: le texte de Xénophon peut donc être utilisé seulement comme illustration d'une des possibilités grammaticales en He 9,15, sans pourtant être contraignant.

Ensuite l'étude de la structure littéraire de l'épître, et de la position de 9,14-15 dans cette structure, nous a appris que l'auteur met très consciemment un rapport presque de «proportionnalité» entre le thème du culte et celui de l'alliance: il n'y a donc pas lieu de nier un lien logique entre 9,14 et 9,15. En plus, ce lien entre les deux thèmes dans la section centrale (8,1-9,28) est présenté du point de vue des trois phases de la médiation sacerdotale. Ces éléments nous permettent de conclure que l'expression διὰ τοῦτο en 9,15 se rapporte bien au verset précédent; la phrase déclare qu'à cause de son sacrifice, le Christ est médiateur d'une alliance nouvelle, et précise en même temps qu'il s'agit d'une médiation sacerdotale.

Via dell'Arancio, 68
00186 Rome

Gabriella BERÉNYI

The Northern Origin of "The Last Words of David" (2 Sam 23,1-7)*

The dating of biblical poetry is an endeavor which attracts many divergent views. Many individual poems are assigned by some scholars to an early period and by other scholars to a late period. To cite what is perhaps the best example of this disagreement, Martin Noth concluded that "das grosse 'Schilfmeerlied' in [Exod] 15,1-19 ist ein verhältnismässig junges Stück" ⁽¹⁾, whereas F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman have spoken of "an early dating of the poem [with] a *terminus ad quem* in the tenth century B.C. for its written composition", with the additional comment that the song "is scarcely later than the twelfth century in its original form" ⁽²⁾. Fortunately, certain methods, especially the linguistic approach, often provide an objective basis for settling such issues ⁽³⁾. In the above instance, for example, the evidence presented by D. A. Robertson is most impressive in pointing towards an early composition for Exod 15,1-18 ⁽⁴⁾.

The situation just described also applies to the problem of determining whether any individual sections of the Bible have a provenance other than Jerusalem or Judah. It is safely assumed that an exceedingly large proportion of biblical literature, especially in its final form, emanated from circles in Jerusalem or from exiles from Jerusalem ⁽⁵⁾. There have been attempts to attribute northern origins to various compositions, e.g., the studies of Otto

* I take this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship for College Teachers program, which enabled me to spend a good portion of the academic year 1986-87 in Jerusalem. Research for the present article was conducted there at the Jewish University and National Library of the Hebrew University and at the Ecole Biblique. I am indebted to the staffs of both institutions, especially Marcel Sigrist of the latter, for many privileges extended to me.

⁽¹⁾ M. NOTH, *Das Zweite Buch Mose, Exodus* (Göttingen 1959) 98.

⁽²⁾ F. M. CROSS and D. N. FREEDMAN, "The Song of Miriam", *JNES* 14 (1955) 240.

⁽³⁾ Two excellent volumes along these lines are A. HURVITZ, *Beyn Lashon le-Lashon* (Jerusalem 1972); and D. A. ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (Missoula, MT 1972).

⁽⁴⁾ ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence*, 154-155.

⁽⁵⁾ Examples, of both prose and poetry, would be the Court History of David, the books of Kings (where the editorial perspective is that of the southern kingdom), the prophets Isaiah, Ezekiel, et al., the many psalms focusing on Zion, etc.

Procksch on the so-called Elohist source⁽⁶⁾, Michael Goulder on the Korah psalms⁽⁷⁾, and H. L. Ginsberg on Deuteronomy and various smaller sections of the Bible⁽⁸⁾. But clearly there has been no unanimity in this regard⁽⁹⁾.

Moreover, the objective basis of linguistic method has not been utilized to settle such issues⁽¹⁰⁾. One of the reasons for this has been the relative lack of linguistic data available. We simply do not have hoards of epigraphic material from northern Israel or from neighboring Canaanite dialects. However, each new inscription found, no matter how small, yields important data which are constantly expanding our knowledge of dialectal differences in ancient Canaan⁽¹¹⁾. Another reason why scholars have not been apt to utilize the linguistic method for determining the provenance of a particular composition is that most have been influenced by the generally held opinion that grammatical differences in BH "have for the most part been obliterated by the harmonizing activity of the Masoretes"⁽¹²⁾. But this is certainly not the case, as various studies have demonstrated considerable dialectal differences within BH⁽¹³⁾.

Accordingly, I believe that just as strides have been made in dating Hebrew poetry based on linguistic criteria, the linguistic approach can also be productive in determining the provenance of a particular poem or pericope in the Bible. There exists now sufficient Northwest Semitic material to act as our guide, and all we need do is reject the notion that BH itself is monolithic. To illustrate the possibilities of this approach I have chosen "the last words of David", 2 Sam 23,1-7. This poem lends itself nicely to such an endeavor for various reasons. First, it is relatively short and unified. Second, though naturally there are difficulties in the poem, the text presents few

⁽⁶⁾ O. PROCKSCH, *Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch, Die Elohimquelle* (Leipzig 1906).

⁽⁷⁾ M. D. GOULDER, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (Sheffield 1982).

⁽⁸⁾ H. L. GINSBERG, *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism* (New York 1982).

⁽⁹⁾ See, for example, the cogent remarks of O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen 1964) 269-271, concerning the view of a northern Elohist source.

⁽¹⁰⁾ A notable exception is GINSBERG, *Israelian Heritage*, 36, where various Phoenicianisms in Proverbs 1-9 are noted to bolster his claim concerning the northern provenance of these chapters.

⁽¹¹⁾ For one example see G. A. RENDSBURG, "The Ammonite Phoneme /T/", *BASOR* (forthcoming); and G. A. RENDSBURG, "More on Hebrew *Šibbōlet*", *JSS* (forthcoming). For a general picture see the excellent volume of W. R. GARR, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.* (Philadelphia 1985).

⁽¹²⁾ E. KAUTZSCH, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, translated by A. E. Cowley (Oxford 1910) vii.

⁽¹³⁾ For general orientation into the question of northern Hebrew, see C. RABIN, "Leshonam shel 'Amos ve-Hoshea'", in B. Z. LURIA, ed., *Iyyunim be-Sefer Tre-'Asar* (Jerusalem 1981) 117-136, especially 117-122. For a specific application, note the northernisms in the stories of the north Israelite kings collected by C. F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford 1903) 208-209. Of a different nature, but also demonstrating dialectal distinctions in BH is G. A. RENDSBURG, *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew* (New Haven, CT, forthcoming), which treats the question of written vs. spoken Hebrew.

if any problems⁽¹⁴⁾. Third, the date of the poem is not subject to great debate. The majority of scholars accept a 10th century date and indeed many affirm David himself as the author of these lines⁽¹⁵⁾.

My thesis concerning 2 Sam 23,1-7 is as follows: there are a number of non-normative uses of BH in this poem which can best be explained as being characteristic of a northern or even northeastern dialect of Hebrew. The clustering of six such linguistic usages in a poem of only seven verses points to a northern origin of the song. The following paragraphs will present the evidence to bolster this conclusion.

The first philological datum is the use of the word *ne'ûm* in v. 1. As is well known, this vocable is regularly used when God is the speaker. Only in four contexts is it used with a human speaker: Num 24,3-4; 24,15-16 with Balaam, Prov 30,1 with Agur, Ps 36,2 in a very obscure manner, and here in 2 Sam 23,1 with David⁽¹⁶⁾. An investigation of the other instances demonstrates that *ne'ûm* in connection with human speakers is a northern usage. Balaam stems from Pethor on the Euphrates in the land of Aram (Num 22,5; Deut 23,5)⁽¹⁷⁾, and his Hebrew is tinged with various Aramaisms. To cite

⁽¹⁴⁾ My own approach is not to emend MT just because a difficulty appears, rather to deal with the text as best one can. It is methodologically sounder, especially when the linguistic approach is involved, to work with actual readings than with hypothesized reconstructed readings. See the astute remarks of A. HURVITZ, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris 1982) 19.

Regarding 2 Sam 23,1-7 in particular, I see no a priori reason to alter MT in any one instance. For an excellent attempt to deal with the poem's most difficult passages, see R. A. CARLSON, *David: The Chosen King* (Stockholm 1964) 254-256, with the comment that "the Masoretic text of 2 Sam. 23:3b-5 is superior to that of the Versions". See further the opinion of H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelbücher* (Göttingen 1960) 329-330.

⁽¹⁵⁾ The following consider the poem to be an authentic Davidic composition: O. PROCKSCH, "Die letzten Worte Davids", in *Alttestamentliche Studien Rudolf Kittel zum 60. Geburtstag* (Leipzig 1913) 112-125; M. H. SEGAL, "Studies in the Books of Samuel. I. David's Three Poems", *JQR* 5 (1914-15) 225-227; HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelbücher*, 330; and K. A. LEIMBACH, *Die Bücher Samuel* (Bonn 1936) 216. Others speak only of the Davidic period: W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (London 1968) 24; H. N. RICHARDSON, "The Last Words of David: Some Notes on II Samuel 23:1-7", *JBL* 90 (1971) 257; F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA 1973) 234-237; D. N. FREEDMAN, "Divine Names and Titles in Early Hebrew Poetry", *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (F. M. CROSS, W. E. LEMKE, and P. D. MILLER, eds.) (Garden City, NY 1976) 73; and P. K. MCCARTER, *II Samuel* (Garden City, NY 1984) 485. Two scholars suggest the Solomonic period, which represents a difference of only a few decades: A. CAQUOT, "La prophétie de Nathan et ses échos lyriques", *Congress Volume, Bonn 1962* (SVT 9; Leiden 1963) 218; and T. ISHIDA, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel* (BZAW 142; Berlin 1977) 107-108.

⁽¹⁶⁾ This has been noted by W. NOWACK, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen 1902) 251; S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 356; and FREEDMAN, "Divine Names and Titles in Early Hebrew Poetry", 74.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, "Bil'âm", *Enşiqlopediya Miqra'it* 2 (1973) 133-134.

two examples: 1) *naḥaš* meaning "magic, fortune, omen" occurs in Hebrew only at Num 23,23, and its cognate is best known from Aramaic *naḥšāšā'*, Syriac *nehšā'*; and 2) *yithaššāb* in Num 23,9 is the only Hithpa'el of the root *ḥšb* in the entire Bible; since one might expect a Niph'al here, we may explain the form by noting the lack of a corresponding N-stem in Aramaic⁽¹⁸⁾. Similarly, Agur stems from Massa which is located by most authorities in the Syrian Desert⁽¹⁹⁾. Although Aramaisms may not be readily apparent in the verses attributed to him, in the passages ascribed to his congener Lemuel king of Massa, we may note such forms as *bar* in Prov 31,2 (*ter*) and *mēlākīn* in Prov 31,3. When we turn to Psalm 36, we once again find forms which resemble Aramaic, specifically the verbs *yehšāyūn* in v. 8 and *yirwēyūn* in v. 9. In both instances the *yod* of III *y* roots is retained, thus representing an important isogloss between the dialect of this psalm and Aramaic⁽²⁰⁾. Furthermore, the non-syncope of the *he* in the form *bēhaššāmayim* in v. 6 may be indicative of northern provenance as well. (This phenomenon is attested in Punic [though admittedly not in any standard Phoenician texts]⁽²¹⁾, and it occurs elsewhere in BH in such texts as 1 Sam 13,21 where the action occurs in the territory of Benjamin, 2 Kgs 7,12K where the speaker is a north Israelite king, Qoh 8,1 where northern influence has long been suspected⁽²²⁾, and Neh 9,19 which apparently originated from the northern kingdom of Israel as well⁽²³⁾.) In other words, the other places in the Bible where *ne'ūm* is employed in a human context suggest that this usage was non-normative Hebrew, or non-Judahite to be more exact. More specifically, these texts: the oracles of Balaam, the words of Agur/Lemuel, and Psalm 36 all contain important isoglosses with Aramaic, suggesting that they stem from the northern or northeastern regions of Israelite settlement⁽²⁴⁾.

(18) For a similar attempt to explain a *crux interpretum* in Balaam's oracles, see E. Y. KUTSCHER, "La-Millon ha-Migra'i", *Leshonenu* 21 (5717) 254-255, though see now G. A. RENDSBURG, "Eblaite *ū-ma* and Hebrew *WM-*", *Eblaitica: Essays on the Ebla Archives and the Eblaite Language* (C. H. GORDON, G. A. RENDSBURG, and N. H. WINTER, eds.) (Winona Lake, IN 1987) 36-37.

(19) See I. EPH'AL, *The Ancient Arabs* (Jerusalem 1982) 218-219.

(20) See, e.g., *yhywn* "they will live" in line 8 of the inscription published by A. CAQUOT, "Une inscription araméenne d'époque assyrienne", *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris 1971) 9-16. Other, though not all, instances of the preservation of the *yod* in 2mpl and 3mpl imperfect III *y* forms in the Bible also occur in contexts where geographical variation is the most probable explanation. Note, e.g., Num 24,6 *nittāyū* in the Balaam oracles; Isa 17,12 *yehemāyūn* in the oracle addressed to Damascus; Isa 21,12 *tīb'ayūn*, *b'ayū*, *'etāyū* in the oracle addressed to Dumah in the Syrian Desert; and a number of such forms in Job.

(21) J. FRIEDRICH and W. RÖLLIG, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik* (Rome 1970) 53.

(22) M. J. DAHOOD, "Canaanite-Phoenician Influences in Qoheleth", *Bib* 33 (1952) 30-52, 191-221, in particular 45-46.

(23) A. C. WELCH, "The Source of Nehemiah IX", *ZAW* 47 (1929) 130-137.

(24) In the case of Balaam, we may be dealing with another phenomenon: the author specifically portrayed the Aramean prophet as speaking a Hebrew mixed with Aramaisms. On this phenomenon elsewhere in the Bible, see N. H. TUR-

The second philological item is a lexicographical one, namely *millāh* in v. 2 (with the pronominal suffix *millātō*). Elsewhere the noun occurs in Ps 19,5; 139,4; Prov 23,9; and 34 times in Job⁽²⁵⁾, and it has been consistently called an Aramaism⁽²⁶⁾. The dangers of labeling a word an Aramaism have been well demonstrated by several scholars⁽²⁷⁾, and the presence of *millāh* in a composition such as Psalm 19 should caution us in the case at hand⁽²⁸⁾. However, the following points need to be considered: a) the fact that the only cognate to Hebrew *millāh* is *miltā'*, *metā'* in the various Aramaic dialects⁽²⁹⁾; b) the weighty evidence of the 34 attestations in Job (13 of which are in the plural form *millin*); and c) the presence of northern influence in Proverbs in general and in chapter 23 in particular⁽³⁰⁾, e.g., the negative particle *bal* in v. 7⁽³¹⁾ and the verb *lhm* meaning "eat" in vv. 1 and 6⁽³²⁾. Accordingly, while I agree that *millāh* should not necessarily be labeled an Aramaism (especially if we define this term as a borrowing from Aramaic), we may wish to consider it a non-Judahite vocable. Its presence in the poe-

SINAI, "'Aramit: Hashpa'at ha-'Aramit 'al ha-'Ivrit shel he-Miqra'", *Ensiqlopediya Miqra'it* 1 (1965) 593-594, who also discussed the III y verbs in Isa 21,12 listed in n. 20 above.

(25) The verbal root *ml* occurs in Gen 21,7; Ps 106,2; Job 8,2; 33,3, and has been shown by G. R. DRIVER, "Hebrew Poetic Diction", *Congress Volume, Copenhagen 1953* (SVT 1; Leiden 1953) 26-39, particularly 30, to be part of the stock of rare words utilized by Israelite poets.

(26) See, e.g., E. KAUTZSCH, *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament* (Halle 1902) 60-61; and M. WAGNER, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im Alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* (Berlin 1966) 77-78.

(27) DRIVER, "Hebrew Poetic Diction"; and A. HURVITZ, "The Chronological Significance of 'Aramaisms' in Biblical Hebrew", *IEJ* 18 (1968) 234-240.

(28) See already T. NÖLDEKE, "Review of E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament*", *ZDMG* 57 (1903) 413.

(29) See L. KOEHLER and W. BAUMGARTNER, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, 3rd edition (Leiden 1974) 556. The Arabic word *millat* is almost certainly a borrowing from Hebrew; see F. BUHL, "Milla", *Enzyklopaedie des Islām* III (Leiden 1936) 573.

(30) This fact does not militate against the well-established relationship between Prov 22,17-24,22 and the Egyptian Wisdom of Amenemopet.

(31) The closest cognates in Semitic are Phoenician and Ugaritic *bl*. See R. S. TOMBACK, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, MT 1978) 46; C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome 1967) 372; and J. AISTLEITNER, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin 1963) 151.

(32) Elsewhere it occurs in Ps 141,4; Prov 4,17; 9,5; and in Ugaritic it is the commonest verb for "eat". Psalm 141 is certainly a northern composition; cf. M. J. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (Garden City, NY 1970) 309. The strongest Phoenician influence on Proverbs is in chapters 1-9; cf. GINSBERG, *Israelian Heritage*, 36. For the Ugaritic verb see GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook*, 427; and AISTLEITNER, *Wörterbuch*, 169-170. In Deut 32,24 *l'hūmē rešep* may mean "attacked by Reshef" or "consumed by Reshef". If it is the former, the passage is not germane. If it is the latter, or if this is a case of polysemy as seems probable, then we have another instance of *lhm* "eat". But even in Deuteronomy 32 there are signs of northern origin as has been argued effectively by O. EISSFELDT, *Das Lied Moses Deut. 32:1-43 und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs Psalm 78 samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes* (Leipzig 1958).

try of 2 Sam 23,1-7, then, would be another indication of this poem's northern origin.

A third grammatical peculiarity which again connects with Aramaic is *kullāham* "all of them" in v. 6, instead of the expected *kullām*. The 3mpl pronominal suffix in Aramaic is *-hm* or *-hwm*, even after consonants, and in fact the very form *klhm* is attested in line 2 of the Kandahar inscription (the feminine counterpart *klhn* is attested in the Arsama correspondence, fragment 26, line 1)⁽³³⁾. It is true that Fekherye now presents us with something unique, namely, the forms *klm* (*bis*) in line 4 and *kln* in line 3⁽³⁴⁾, but the overall picture is not greatly affected⁽³⁵⁾.

Some scholars have opted simply to emend *kullāham* to *kullām*⁽³⁶⁾, while others appear ready to retain the consonants as long as the vowels are altered to *kullāhem* or *kull^hhem*⁽³⁷⁾. This is not the place to enter into the debate surrounding textual emendation; the methodological problems involved are well known. Suffice to say that in the present instance, especially in light of the comments in note 14 above, there is no *a priori* reason to alter MT *kullāham*, certainly not the consonants and probably not the vowels either. A much sounder approach is to accept the form as a dialectal variation.

In fact, some scholars have argued that *klhm*, however it is to be vocalized, is an archaic form representing a stage of the language before intervocalic *he* was elided⁽³⁸⁾. But it is doubtful if the morphophonemics of standard (= Jerusalemite or Judahite) Hebrew of the 10th century B.C.E., even of the poetic idiom, was still operating with this option. Instead, I would argue that *kullāham* represents a dialectal variation based on geographical lines, namely, it was characteristic of the Hebrew spoken in areas adjoining the Aramaic-speech communities. This theory gains some support by noting the contexts of other instances in the Bible where the *he* is not elided in 3mpl and 3fpl pronominal suffixes following a consonant. Although none of the suffixes in the following examples correlate exactly with *kullāham*, note that 2 Kgs 9,18 *'ad-hēm* occurs in a north Israelite setting, 1 Kgs 7,37 *kullāhnāh* occurs in the description of the building of the Temple where Phoenician evidence may be detected (e.g., the month names Ziv and Bul), and Ezek 13,17 *libb^hhen*, Ezek 16,53 *š^hbīthen*, Ezek 16,53 *btōkāhnāh* occur in a book with well-known Aramaic influences⁽³⁹⁾.

⁽³³⁾ S. SEGERT, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1975) 170, 173, 222; and R. DEGEN, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden 1969) 55-56.

⁽³⁴⁾ See T. MURAOKA, "The Tell-Fekherye Bilingual Inscription and Early Aramaic", *Abr-Nahrain* 22 (1983-84) 92.

⁽³⁵⁾ See GARR, *Dialect Geography*, 105-106.

⁽³⁶⁾ E.g., A. SCHULZ, *Die Bücher Samuel* (Münster 1920) 271, 273; and NOWACK, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, 253.

⁽³⁷⁾ P. A. H. DE BOER, "Texte et traduction des paroles attribuées à David en 2 Samuel xxiii 1-7", *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956* (SVT 4; Leiden 1957) 55; and MCCARTER, *II Samuel*, 478.

⁽³⁸⁾ DE BOER, "Texte et traduction", 55; RICHARDSON, "The Last Words of David", 265; and MCCARTER, *II Samuel*, 478.

⁽³⁹⁾ I admit, however, that other instances cannot be so easily explained: Isa 3,17 *pāthēn*; Gen 21,28 *l^hbadd^hhen*; Lev 8,16; 8,25 *hēlbb^hhen*.

These three usages, the word *nē'ûm* attached to human speakers, the lexeme *millāh*, and the form *kullāham*, are characteristic of non-standard, i.e., non-Judahite, Hebrew of the 10th century B.C.E. From the evidence presented, it may be posited that these three items represent isoglosses shared by Aramaic and a Hebrew dialect in northern or northeastern Israel. Concentrated as they are within a few verses, we may conclude that the author of 2 Sam 23,1-7 was an Israelite from the far northern or northeastern part of Israel (approximately the tribal areas of Dan, Naphtali, and eastern Manasseh, perhaps even Zebulun, Issachar, and northern Gad). If, on the other hand, we wish to uphold the Davidic authorship of these verses, we may wish to posit a scribe who spoke this particular dialect of Hebrew.

Three linguistic usages may not be sufficient to prove our claims, so it is worth suggesting three additional elements in the poem which are exceptional in BH. They do not share a common ground with Aramaic usage, but there are indications of northern usage nonetheless. The first of these is the expression *dibber-bî* "spoke to me" in v. 2. Normally, the verb *dbr* is governed by the preposition *l* or *'el*⁽⁴⁰⁾. When the preposition *b* is used, it means "about, against, through"⁽⁴¹⁾, but it is clear that this is not the case here. The only other places in the Bible where *dbr b-* means simply "speak to" are 1 Kgs 22,28 where the northern prophet Micaiah is speaking and Hos 1,2 which once more places us in a northern setting⁽⁴²⁾. Accordingly, the plain usage of *dbr b-* was presumably a northern variant to standard Hebrew *dbr l-* or *dbr 'l*.

The second additional usage to be forwarded is the divine name *'al* in v. 1. This theophore was first noted by H. S. Nyberg⁽⁴³⁾ and it has been proposed in various other places in the Bible and elsewhere⁽⁴⁴⁾. In point of fact, however, most of these suggestions are spurious. Apart from 2 Sam 23,1, I would affirm only the following instances: a) 1 Sam 2,10 where *'ālāw* is parallel to *yhw* in words spoken by Hannah of the tribe of Ephraim; b) the personal name *'ēlî* who ministers at Shiloh; c) the personal name *yhw'ly* in Samaria Ostrakon 55:2; d) the personal name *ym'l* in UT 2106:4; and e) the term *'ly* parallel to *b'l* in UT 126:III:6,8. From this list it is probable that we are dealing with a northern phenomenon, and this may be used as further evidence for the northern provenance of "the last words of David".

⁽⁴⁰⁾ F. BROWN, S. R. DRIVER, and C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1907) 181.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁴²⁾ DRIVER, *Samuel*, 357, suggests other attestations where *dbr b-* means "speak to", but a closer examination reveals other nuances to be present, e.g., Hab 2,1 where *lir'ôt mah ydabber bî* must mean "to see what he will speak against me", especially in light of the following stich *ûmāh 'āsib 'al tôkaḥtî* "and how I shall respond upon my reproof".

⁽⁴³⁾ H. S. NYBERG, "Studien zur Religionskampf im Alten Testament", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 35 (1938) 329-387.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ For complete discussion see A. COOPER and M. H. POPE, "Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts", *Ras Shamra Parallels III* (S. RUMMEL, ed.) (Rome 1981) 451-458.

The final piece of evidence to be adduced is the use of *kēn* in v. 5. The stich *kī lô' kēn bēti 'im 'ēl* has evoked much discussion. One issue, which is only tangentially relevant here, is whether *l'* is to be read as the negative particle or as the asseverative particle. S. R. Driver, for example, opted for the former and read the line as a question "For is not my house thus with God?"⁽⁴⁵⁾, whereas H. P. Smith, for example, selected the latter route and translated "Verily, sure is my house with God"⁽⁴⁶⁾. Although this issue may affect our understanding of *kēn*, in reality it matters little since the overall sense of the line is unaffected⁽⁴⁷⁾.

More germane for the present discussion is how to translate *kēn*. A common suggestion is "firm, established"⁽⁴⁸⁾, but in Hebrew this would be *nākōn* not *kēn*⁽⁴⁹⁾. Other attempts to render *kēn* as "thus, like this"⁽⁵⁰⁾, or as "so, just, right"⁽⁵¹⁾ are more faithful to the usual meanings of the word in Hebrew, but both are forced within the context of the line. The actual intention of the line has been sensed by several scholars, but they have had to translate *kēn* very loosely to deliver this meaning. Otto Procksch renders the stich "So lebt mein Haus vor Gott"⁽⁵²⁾, and H. W. Hertzberg very similarly translates "So (lebt) mein Haus mit Gott"⁽⁵³⁾. These renderings reflect the proper understanding of *kēn*, whose basic sense here is one of existence. Such a meaning is attested for *kēn* in Phoenician and Ugaritic, for in both languages the root *kwn* is the common verb "to be"⁽⁵⁴⁾. In other words, *kī lô' kēn bēti 'im 'ēl* means "For *is* not my house with God?" or "For indeed my house *is* with God", again depending on how one understands *l'*. The use of *kēn* in 2 Sam 23,1-7 for the verb "to be", exactly as in Phoenician texts, is another indication of the poem's northern authorship.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ DRIVER, *Samuel*, 359-360.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ H. P. SMITH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (Edinburgh 1899) 382.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ For this reason, if for no other, the radical emendations and restorations proposed by PROCKSCH, "Die letzten Worte Davids", 118-119; and S. MOWINCKEL, "'Die letzten Worte Davids', II Sam 23 1-7", *ZAW* 40 (1927) 30-58, are totally unnecessary, if not absurd.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ JPSV; NJPSV; *Jerusalem Bible*; CARLSON, *David the Chosen King*, 256; and RICHARDSON, "The Last Words of David", 259.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ In fact, emendation to *nākōn* has been suggested by A. B. EHRLICH, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* III (Leipzig 1910) 341; BHK, *ad loc.*; and others.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ T. N. D. METTINGER, "'The Last Words of David', A Study of Structure and Meaning in II Samuel 23:1-7", *SEA* 41/42 (1976-77) 153-154; and MCCARTER, *II Samuel*, 482.

⁽⁵¹⁾ DE BOER, "Texte et traduction", 54; CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 236.

⁽⁵²⁾ PROCKSCH, "Die letzten Worte Davids", 112.

⁽⁵³⁾ HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelbücher*, 329.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ TOMBACK, *Phoenician and Punic*, 140-141; GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook*, 418; and AISTLEITNER, *Wörterbuch*, 151. Incidentally, H. L. GINSBERG, "The Northwest Semitic Languages", *Patriarchs* (B. MAZAR, ed.) (The World History of the Jewish People, II; Tel-Aviv 1970) 105, lists *kwn* "to be" as one of the lexical features which distinguishes his Phoenic group (= Phoenician-Ugaritic) from Hebrew.

Our investigation has turned up six instances of non-normative Hebrew usage within the seven verses which comprise "the last words of David" in 2 Sam 23,1-7. Two of these (*millāh*, *kullāham*) are paralleled in Aramaic, one (human use of *n'ûm*) points very strongly in that direction, one (*dbr b-*) is paralleled in the Bible only in northern compositions, one (*'āl*) is limited to northern Israel and to Ugaritic texts, and one (*kēn*) is paralleled in Phoenician and Ugaritic. The obvious conclusion, already noted above, is that the poem stems from the northern or northeastern regions of Israel. Either the author himself hailed from this area or, if we wish to affirm the biblical statement of Davidic authorship, we must assume a scribe who hailed from this area⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
U.S.A.

Gary A. RENDSBURG

⁽⁵⁵⁾ If I may be permitted a bit of speculation, we may wish to consider the possibility that the poem stems from Mahanaim in Trans-Jordan. The exact location of the site is still debated, but the Jabbok valley is its general locale; see Y. AHARONI, "Maḥanayim", *Enṣiqlopediya Miḡra'it* 4 (1970) 806-807. This city served briefly as David's capital during the rebellion of Absalom (see 2 Sam 17,24; 17,27; 19,33) and there he was greeted by nobles from Gilead. Since David's stay there occurred during the end of his reign and since 2 Sam 23,1-7 purports to be his "last words", we may wish to make the connection.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

David JOBLING, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible*, II (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 39). 152 p. 21,3 × 13,5. Sheffield 1986. JSOT Press. US \$18.50.

As a sequel to his *The Sense of Biblical Narrative I*, Jobling's present volume documents the shifting concerns of one of the more adventuresome minds within biblical studies. Jobling's exegetical stance is still basically structuralist, yet he has both lessened his need to use technical "jargon" and widened the scope of his questions to include feminist and socio-historical concerns. The volume's three largely independent chapters are on Gen 2,4b-3,24, deuteronomistic political theory and the place of Transjordan in Israelite ideology. The most engaging of these in my opinion is the second. Indeed, Jobling himself considers this essay on the deuteronomistic political theory underlying Judg 2,11-1 Sam 12 "the most groundbreaking of the three studies" (p. 9). Taken together, Jobling's three essays are the impressive result of an inquiring mind unafraid to consider the types of problems that modern scholarship in the humanities and social sciences suggests to today's student of the Bible. The older historical and literary-historical questions about biblical narrative no longer appear as relevant or compelling as they once did. Most biblical scholars recognize this, yet many admit confusion about what precisely to do about it. Happily there are a few scholars among us—and Jobling is one of them—who are committed to taking some tentative steps forward. Such quibbles and cautions as I include in my review of each of his essays ought not to detract from the importance of Jobling's efforts. Like Norman Gottwald, with whom he is in frequent dialogue, Jobling is helping to define a set of questions which the present generation of biblical scholars needs to address.

Jobling's treatment of Gen 2,4b-3,24 uses Greimas's actantial model to describe its meaning as myth, Propp's functional model to explain its meaning as folktale, and Naidoff's insights ("A Man to Work the Soil: A New Interpretation of Genesis 2-3", *JSOT* 5 [1978] 2-14) to underline its main thematic concerns. Along the way, Jobling reacts to scholars who have themselves discussed this pericope in novel ways, such as Edmund Leach, Robert Culley and, especially, Phyllis Trible. Jobling's discussion is highly suggestive: he believes that a dominant "mythic" voice speaking of the creation and fall of man has superficially succeeded in upstaging a folkloric voice concerned with showing how it came about that man is "tiller of the earth". Paradoxically, however, the upstaged story finally subverts the myth at a

deeper level "because of the greater unifying power of the folk-tale model" (p. 27). Using Propp's model, Jobling suggests that the folktale presents Eden as disorder and man's expulsion from it as order restored. In this Proppian reading, God, the villain of the piece, almost succeeds in keeping "man" in a blissfully drugged state of idyllic passivity and ignorance (a disorder in which he villainously had placed them) but for the crucial intervention of the serpent and the woman, who both help "mankind" recover its original pre-edenic order. Thus "the possibility is evoked that the human transformation in which the woman took powerful initiative was positive, rather than negative, that the complex human world is to be preferred over any male ideal" (p. 43). Jobling's willingness to consider the "villainous" aspects of Yahweh's role, as well as the respectively active-passive aspects of the female-male roles in the story, will undoubtedly evoke strong reaction from many, mostly patriarchal, quarters within and without biblical studies.

Ch. 2 on "Deuteronomistic Political Theory in Judges and 1 Samuel 1-12" proposes to study Judg 2,11 to 1 Sam 12 and "broaches the question, 'What form of government is appropriate for Israel?'" (p. 45). Unlike most of his colleagues who deal with this material, Jobling asks "What... is the final form of the Deuteronomistic History doing?" (p. 45), and unlike most of them, he assumes that he has a responsibility toward that final form, just as whoever was responsible for it took responsibility for the complex statement concerning monarchy contained within it. He rightly points to the interpretational limitations of most redactional theories about the History. After considering the entire section in totality (Part 1), Jobling offers a detailed reading of Judg 6-9, suggesting that this pericope offers a proleptically balancing perspective that "point by point... opposes the view of kingship embodied in the Saul of 1 Sam 8-12" (p. 85). Judg 6-9 is mostly negative where 1 Sam 8-12 is mostly positive concerning the monarchy. Jotham closes off kingship for Israel as decisively as Samuel leaves it open. Jotham, as "the worthy refuser" of the throne, is to the proto-monarchical story in Judges what Jonathan is to the monarchical story in 1 Samuel. The Gideon-Abimelek episode in Judges puts into proper perspective the complex Deuteronomistic debate over judgeship-kingship just as the Saul episode in chs. 8-12 contextualizes it within 1 Samuel, but with one important difference: the first episode is a proleptic corrective of the second, and both together illustrate how "the deuteronomistic treatment of monarchy is a classic example of talking around a contradiction" (p. 46). There is no one I know of who in wrestling with the narrative logic of this large block of material offers a more perceptive and persuasive account of it than David Jobling does here. There are many incisive suggestions in his discussion and I will mention a few of them before offering some suggestions of my own concerning areas where Jobling's reading is in my opinion questionable.

If one agrees that the judicial cyclical system expressed in Judg 2,11-3,6 is meant to be in effect through 1 Sam 7, then Jobling's emphasis on *gaps* in the History (periods when judges do not rule Israel) being *programmed* into the cycle and then expressed in many of the stories that follow it is most illuminating in its literary and ideological implications. The judicial gap, say, of Judg 17-21 both illuminates and is illuminated by the subsequent judicial

gap in 1 Sam 4,19-7,2. This insight allows Jobling to illustrate concretely how the judicial system involves problems of political discontinuity which the monarchic system in many ways sought to solve. (But for some apposite remarks on the question of monarchy and (dis)continuity, see S. Talmon, "The Biblical Idea of Statehood", *The Bible World* [ed. G. Rendsburg] [New York 1980] 239-248.) At the same time, Jobling shows how crucial one's understanding of 1 Sam 7 is for establishing, or at least suggesting, a coherent deuteronomic perspective on the judgeship-kingship debate, especially as this chapter relates to 1 Sam 8-12 wherein "the text is so arranged as to view the rise of monarchy within the logic which the judge-cycles established and to invite comparison between the two systems of government" (p. 51). One final illustration of Jobling's many insights into the text is the way in which the story's "judge-logic" influences 1 Sam 8's characterization of the people's request for a king as "*the apostasy which starts a new judge cycle*, and the Ammonite oppression [as] the consequent punishment!" (p. 65). Because of insights like these, Jobling is able to arrive at a number of important conclusions concerning Judges-1 Samuel that merit our consideration.

Nevertheless, there are two significant aspects of his discussion which invite serious questions: first, his application of Judg 6-9, as a proleptic treatment of the theme of monarchy, to the rest of the History, and second, his understanding of 1 Sam 8-12 as presenting a significantly positive view of kingship in stark contrast to the negative picture of it in Judg 6-9. A portion of his concluding statement deserves to be quoted since it establishes the significant relationship between the two pericopes:

1 Sam 8-12 thus betrays the need for another view which it itself cannot express because of the constraints it is under. I wish to suggest that, within the totality of the Deuteronomic History, Judg 6-9 provides that other view proleptically. If the whole narrative of the judge-period prepares us generally to read 1 Sam. 8-12, Judg 6-9 does so much more specifically. The rise of monarchy has happened before! Judg 6-9 adjusts our reading of 1 Sam. 8-12, as it were, in advance. Being under no constraint to portray kingship positively, it can explore thoroughly its dubious aspects (p. 85).

It is clear from Jobling's discussion of Judg 6-9 in how many significant ways this pericope is a proleptic view of that Israelite kingship first set in motion in 1 Sam 8 by the people's request for a king. However, a serious obstacle to the way Jobling applies this generally convincing account of Judg 6-9 as proleptic to 1 Sam 8-12 is his requiring us to accept a foreshadowing incident as meant to counter or significantly correct the subsequent events it foreshadows. What Jobling is suggesting is a significant incoherence between proleptic portrait and its future reality, as depicted by the same editors guiding the larger story-line. How much more plausible and elegant it would be to suggest, as I believe the case to be, that Judg 6-9 is a condemnation of kingship that proleptically anticipates the similarly negative picture of it in 1 Sam 8-12. Moreover, the positive picture of kingship which Jobling suggests for 1 Sam 8-12 appears to me too sharply set it off from chs. 13-31. On two counts, then, that are central to his reading—a proleptic account that opposes the ideological account of kingship it foreshadows, and an account of

the inauguration of kingship in 1 Samuel that opposes the account of its development within the book—Jobling does not entirely succeed in showing how what the Deuteronomists say about monarchy is sufficiently coherent, either literarily or ideologically, to merit our attending to the complexity he insists is central to their position. Perhaps many of Jobling's insights and conclusions in this chapter support a greater coherence within the History than Jobling himself allows: Judg 6–9 *does* foreshadow 1 Sam 8–12, as he suggests, but it may be in a supportive rather than a negating manner. 1 Sam 8–12 can be seen as ideologically much more consistent with what follows it in the History than Jobling would allow.

I would suggest two reasons for the way Jobling relates the Jotham episode to 1 Sam 8–12. First, sometimes in his discussions outside of Judg 6–9, especially within 1 Sam 8–12, Jobling fails to consider passages in terms of their *voice-structure*. Whereas in Judg 8–9 he attends to this feature—as when he points out the ideological relationship of Jotham's voice to that of the narrator, to the benefit of his reading (pp. 70ff.)—in 1 Sam 8–12 his failing to do so results in an apparently gratuitous identification of Samuel's words with the ideological perspective of God and the narrator, and in a positive picture of kingship based upon such an identification. It is possible that the position of the narrator and God is significantly critical of Samuel both before and after ch. 8. Whether this is so, however, depends on a thorough discussion of the various ideological portraits which the narrator paints of his characters, yet Jobling never addresses this question in 1 Sam 8–12. Second, Jobling ends up with a greater incoherence in the Deuteronomist's ideology on kingship than is warranted because, I would suggest, his normal approach to the study of the text—first paradigmatic, then syntagmatic analysis (p. 15) — is contrary to an order of study more consonant with the genre which he is reading, “the primary *narrative*” in David Noel Freedman's apt designation. Jobling's habit of doing an “isotopic analysis” before a detailed systematic reading of the narrative (his “syntagmatic analysis”) appears to be a central cause of his reading of 1 Sam 8–12 as predominantly positive toward the institution of monarchy. Jobling's emphasis on isotopic analysis, while providing us with many valuable insights into the text, probably also explains why he can articulate the contrast between chs. 8–12 and chs. 13ff. so starkly.

Jobling's third essay, on the significance of Transjordan in Israelite ideology, contains illuminating discussions, not the least of which is his articulation of the importance of the tribe of Manasseh: “The tribe which mediates the problem of all Israel... also recapitulates it” (p. 119). Manasseh straddles the Jordanian border and thus represents the same problematic as the nation to which it belongs: part recapitulates whole. Jobling's attempt here to use social-scientific models “as a potential bridge between structuralist and socio-historical approaches” (p. 132) is also saddled with some unnecessary burdens. Given the sociological, historical and literary complexities of the genealogical and geographic traditions he has chosen to discuss in so brief a space, such constraints require that an essayist take extreme care to integrate his argument and simplify his analyses. Jobling's discussion of the transjordanian question in my opinion appears more fragmented and less successfully

revised than his previous two chapters. For example, Jobling's choice of relevant texts for discussion explicitly neglects Deuteronomy so as to keep his essay within manageable length (p. 92), yet I believe his considerable skill in analysis would have produced an even better synthesis had he neglected the Numbers traditions instead of Deuteronomy. Similarly, his decision to discuss the Jephthah cycle only as a test-case subsequent to his main analysis, and not as an integral part of his analysis, tends to split the force of his argumentation.

This volume is an important and valuable contribution to the areas it discusses and deserves serious attention from everyone interested in contemporary debates within biblical studies.

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1S 5B6

Robert POLZIN

Giovanni GARBINI, *Storia e ideologia nell'Israele Antico* (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia dei tempi biblici 3). 254 S. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice.

Der Klappentext zu dieser Veröffentlichung von 14 zunächst unverbunden nebeneinanderstehend erscheinenden Kapiteln verheißt eine Musteruntersuchung zur althebräischen Geschichtsschreibung, die mit "strenger philologischer Methode" durchgeführt werde. In seinem *Vorwort* gibt der Verfasser als sein einziges durchgängiges Ziel an, "zu erforschen, wieviel Geschichte und wieviel und welche Ideologie im Erbe der alten hebräischen Geschichtsüberlieferung" enthalten sei (10). Mit 'Geschichte' meint der Verf. eine Ereignisfolge und deren Darstellung, mit 'Ideologie' eine durch Interessen bestimmte Perspektive, die die Geschichtsdarstellung prägt und sich dazu noch eine geschichtliche Vergangenheit erfindet (11). Mit historisch-kritischer Haltung bezeichnet er dann die Annahme, daß im AT politische Meinung sich als religiöse darstelle (Propheten), daß solche religiösen Anschauungen sich als historische ausgäben (Geschichtsschreiber) und daß solche erfundene heilige Geschichte (*una storia fittizia ma sacra*) weder Politik noch Religion noch Geschichte sei, sondern nur Ideologie (12).

Die "strenge philologische Methode", der der Verf. in den einzelnen Kapiteln dann folgt, sieht meist so aus, daß er zunächst einen Textabschnitt oder ein biblisches Buch derart nacherzählt, als ob es eine Schilderung von Ereignisabläufen oder eine Darstellung von politischen oder sozialen Verhältnissen eines bestimmten vorexilischen Zeitabschnitts sei (literar-, gattungs- und redaktionskritische Differenzierungen werden z.T. bewußt *nicht* vorgenommen); anschließend wird diese "Geschichtsdarstellung" *ad absurdum* geführt anhand von "Widersprüchen", sei es zu anderen AT-Stellen, sei es zu außerbiblischen Zeugnissen. Dabei werden prinzipiell die außerbiblischen

Zeugnisse, deren z.T. wenig plausible Deutungen und die durch den Verf. daraus gezogenen Schlußfolgerungen als "faktisch-historisch", der AT-Text aber als "ideologisch" gewertet. Schließlich benennt der Verf. als verantwortliche Autoren für diese die historischen Tatsachen derart verfälschenden oder Personen und Geschichtsabläufe erfindenden Texte Gruppierungen in nach-exilischer Zeit (achämenidisch, ptolemäisch, hasmonäisch, römisch), die er als "babylonisch-antiägyptisch", "priesterlich", "jerusalemisch" oder "pharisäisch" kennzeichnet.

Daß die von anderen Forschern bisher vorgetragenen sehr unterschiedlichen Datierungsvorschläge der AT-Texte *Hypothesen* waren, steht nicht in Frage; daß die jeweiligen Argumente den Verf. nicht überzeugt haben (das ist wohl mit *non hanno nessuna prova a loro fondamento* gemeint), wird aus seinen Ausführungen deutlich; ob aber die Hypothesen des Verf. und die von ihm vorgelegten Begründungen und Folgerungen (außer in dieser oder jener Einzelfrage) als plausibler zu beurteilen sein werden, ist dem Rez. zweifelhaft. Diese Zweifel sollen im folgenden anhand einiger Punkte beispielhaft skizziert werden.

Zum 1. Kap. "La storia di Israele": Tatsächlich haben bisher vor allem Alttestamentler, also Theologen, Darstellungen der Geschichte Israels verfaßt und sich für weite Abschnitte mangels anderer Quellen und Zeugnisse auf eine mehr oder weniger kritische Paraphrase des AT beschränkt; soweit sie dabei zu ihrer Zeit erreichbare archäologische und inschriftliche Zeugnisse, die zu einer anderen Darstellung genötigt hätten, unbeachtet gelassen haben, sind sie zu kritisieren und zu korrigieren — wie jeder andere *storico di professione* (vgl. bereits die auch im Tonfall dem Verf. vorangehenden Ausführungen von M. Liverani in seiner *de Vaux-Rezension* [OrAnt 1976]). Angesichts der scharfen Rundumschlag-Kritik des Verf. an anderen Forschern fragt sich der Leser jedoch, ob z.B. die grundsätzliche Einschätzung des Verf. bezüglich der Autoren des "DtrG", — um ihre "(antimonarchische) These" zu belegen, hätten sie zwar im wesentlichen die Königsnamen richtig überliefert, aber Chronologie, Unternehmungen, Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse und Dynastien nach Belieben manipuliert (34), — weniger korrekturbedürftig ist. Aber nicht nur derartige Globalurteile, sondern auch eine Fülle von Einzelbehauptungen mindern das Vertrauen des Lesers, in diesem Werk könne er von einem umsichtig argumentierenden, unvoreingenommenen *Historiker* gesichert Neues lernen; Beispiele: die Merneptah-Stele bezeugt keineswegs "*seminomadische* Leute, die sich Israel nannten" oder einen Stamm bildeten (34; die vielseitige Diskussion zum nichtstaatlichen Israel scheint dem Verf. kaum bekannt zu sein; vgl. dazu jetzt N. P. Lemche, *Early Israel* [VTS 37; Leiden 1985]); die Mutmaßungen des Verf., weshalb von Königen Israels oder Judas bisher keine Inschriften gefunden worden seien, die aber — wie bei allen Nachbarvölkern — existiert haben *mußten*, sind nicht gerade stark abgestützt (37f.: die Königsinschriften seien systematisch zerstört worden, aus Haß gegen das Königtum oder um Daten, die der AT-Geschichtskonstruktion widersprachen, verschwinden zu lassen); da *hebräische* Inschriften nur südlich einer Linie Yavne Yam — Nordende des Toten Meeres und östlich der Philisterstädte am Meer gefunden wurden, und zwar nur zwischen dem 8. und dem Anfang des 6. Jhdts., und da Israel und Juda so spärlich anderswo erwähnt

seien, kommt der Verf. zu seinem Urteil, die Bibel dokumentiere, "was man gewollt hätte, daß es wäre, was jedoch nicht war" (40).

Auch in den folgenden Kapiteln trägt der Verf. unermüdlich seinen Kampf gegen die *storicità del racconto* im AT aus — und gewinnt in seiner Darstellung natürlich immer: David tötete nie Goliath (eine aufmerksam zuhörende Beschäftigung mit der Gattung "Kindheits- und Jugendgeschichten" ['Kindheitsgeschichten' erzählen an Begebenheiten und Erlebnissen der Kindheit des Helden Taten und Wirkungen des Erwachsenen und dessen Bedeutung bis in die Gegenwart des Erzählers] hätte die Ausführungen des Verf. S. 43f. in eine andere Richtung gelenkt); David habe nie Hiram von Tyrus kennengelernt, nie die Edomiter, Ammoniter, Amalekiter und Aramäer geschlagen und keinerlei Imperium geschaffen; seinem Sohn Salomo gelang es, den kleinen Staat seines Vaters zu halten, er erbaute sich einen Palast in Verbindung mit einem Tempelchen für den Dynastiegott; er heiratete keine Pharaonentochter, wurde auch nicht durch internationalen Handel reich und erlitt wahrscheinlich den Plündereinfall des Scheschonk — dies sei das Maximum an tatsächlichen Geschehnissen im 10. Jh.v.C., alles übrige, wenn nicht überhaupt alles, gehöre zur Geschichte der hebräischen Ideologie (55f.). Wenn der Verf. im 3. Kap. dann versucht, "die Dinge wirklich historisch zu betrachten", sieht er sich durch den Mescha-Stein genötigt, Omris Regierungszeit über die 12 biblischen Jahre hinaus auf ca. 40 zu erhöhen und Ahasja und Joram aus der Liste der Könige Israels zu streichen und glaubt so, zu einer Aussage des Textes vor seiner deuteronomistischen Redaktion zurückgekommen zu sein (61ff.). Ausgehend von den zwei bekannten Usija-Siegeln "gelingt" es dem Verf., den in der Bibel in seiner Bedeutung verschwiegene König Asarja-Usija von Juda und Israel wiederzuentdecken, dessen Unternehmungen und Reichtum das AT dem Salomo überschrieb, während es ihn zum Aussätzigen machte (64-71).

Der Verf. urteilt im 4. Kap. "Ursprung und Entwicklung des Jahwismus" über frühere Forscher, sie seien mehr von leider uneingestandenem konfessionellem Interesse bestimmt gewesen als von wissenschaftlicher Objektivität (85). Nach gründlicher Lektüre der Ausführungen des Verf. gewinnt der Leser jedoch den Eindruck, daß das Interesse dieser Forscher an der religiösen Dimension der Wirklichkeit und der Geschichte ihnen den sympathischen und damit sachgemäßen (= wissenschaftliche Objektivität ermöglichenden) Zugang zu manchem ermöglicht hat, was dem Verf. verschlossen blieb, obwohl er umfassende Information über verschiedene archäologische und inschriftliche Daten hatte, die noch vor einigen Jahren nicht bekannt waren. Er sieht das ganze AT als Zeugnis eines Demythisierungsversuchs einiger Kreise, die das Wirken der Gottheit aus der Natur in die Geschichte verlegen wollten, während die ältere 'hebräische Religion' ihre Wurzeln in Palästina/Syrien innerhalb der bäuerlichen Bevölkerung gehabt habe (89). Die dem Mose zugeschriebene religiöse Botschaft sei in Palästina selbst gegen die Religion der Bevölkerung entstanden; einige prophetische Kreise kämpften für eine religiöse Reform, die die rein sittliche Verehrung eines einzigen Gottes angestrebt und als Ziel gehabt habe, aus Israel etwas Außergewöhnliches, Einmaliges unter allen Völkern zu machen, indem sie es in direkte und exklusive Beziehung zu seinem Gott stellte (92). Der Verf. "weiß" auch, weshalb die im

Kampf mit der phönikischen (so schreibt der Verf. meist für 'kanaanäischen') Religion siegreiche JHWH-Verehrung von außerhalb Palästinas, vom Sinai, gekommen sein soll: Die Ankunft eines neuen Volkes in Palästina, das an JHWH glaubt, sei für die Vorgeschichte Israels anachronistisch, passe aber für die Rückkehr einer Exulantengruppe aus Babylon nach Jerusalem, daher stamme die Negierung der Autochthonie, die Abgrenzung vom 'Volk des Landes', d.h. den Nichtexilierten, die Verleugnung der mit anderen Gruppen gemeinsamen JHWH-Verehrung in Syrien/Palästina (96ff.).

Auch die nachfolgenden Kapitel sind durch das Vorstehende methodisch schon ausreichend gekennzeichnet: DtJes sei nicht vor Darius geschrieben, der mit ihm aufgebrochene Universalismus unter Xerxes wieder beendet (129ff.); der Ursprung der Zwölfzahl der Stämme Israels liege in der Liturgie und habe besondere Bedeutung erst in achämenidischer Zeit bei der Jerusalemer Priesterschaft gewonnen (170); das Buch Genesis sei bei den Juden in Ägypten nicht anerkannt gewesen, die LXX habe dort die neueste Edition der Tora (im 3. Jh. v.C. entstanden innerhalb der dezidiert anti-ägyptischen, hierarchischen Oligarchie, *classe sacerdotale*, von Jerusalem) erst in Umlauf gebracht, während der ägyptische Pentateuch bis dahin wohl Ex-Jos umfaßte (183-207). Für seine im 13. Kap. ausgebreitete These über Esra kündigt der Verf. eine eigene Monographie an (Esra sei eine rein literarische Schöpfung nach dem Modell von Nehemia; 1 Esr stelle eine ideologische Projektion dar von Alkimos' Beseitigung der Trennwand zwischen Priestern und Israeliten im Tempel, einer Liturgiereform der 'Söhne Aarons' gegen die 'Söhne Sados' im Jahre 159 v.C.; das kanonische Esrabuch sei eine Revision von 1 Esr gegen Ende des 1. Jh. n.C.; mit dem nie existiert habenden Esra sei um/nach 159 v.C. das Judentum, wie es bis heute lebt, entstanden [208-235]). Ein Stellen- (249f.) und ein Autorenregister (251-254) beschließen das Werk.

Phil.-Theol. Hochschule St. Georgen
Offenbacher Landstr. 224
D-6000 Frankfurt am Main 70

Helmut ENGEL S.J.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. In Verbindung mit G. W. ANDERSON, H. CAZELLES, D. N. FREEDMAN, SH. TALMON und G. WALLIS herausgegeben von G. J. BOTTERWECK (†), H. RINGGREN, H.-J. FABRY. Band V: מדר — עוב. pp. xvi-631. Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1986. Verlag W. Kohlhammer.

La pubblicazione di un volume del *TWAT*, di cui presto riprenderà la pubblicazione in italiano, costituisce un avvenimento importante sia per il semitista che per il teologo. Il nostro è apparso a due anni di distanza dall'ultimo, e ci conduce all'inizio della lettera 'ajin. Se l'opera riuscirà a mantene-

re il presente ritmo di pubblicazione, dovrebbe essere terminata all'inizio degli anni '90 con al massimo ancora due volumi.

Anche questo volume si richiama continuamente all'ebraico epigrafico, all'ugaritico, all'aramaico ed alle altre lingue semitiche, per cui anche chi non s'interessa di teologia ne ricaverà informazioni utili. Le bibliografie sono di quanto più internazionale si possa desiderare, per cui l'opera fa veramente onore al comitato di redazione.

Le voci maggiormente svolte sono: *népeš*, *nātan*, *nāšā'*, *'ābad* e *'ābar*; i sostantivi *nāšī'* e *'ibrī* sono trattati separatamente dalle rispettive radici, cosa pienamente giustificata data la loro autonomia da queste; lo stesso non si può però dire della rad. *nšb/jšb* ed il termine *maššēbāh*, parola invece esaminata a parte nel vol. IV, cc. 1064-1074, per la penna, poi, di due autori differenti. Manca invece il termine *nōqēd*, cosa notevole non tanto per il valore culturale in passato arbitrariamente conferito alla parola quanto come termine tecnico-economico legato all'allevamento estensivo di bestiame minuto. Particolarmente interessanti sono sul piano filologico le voci *marzeḥ* di H.-J. Fabry (un termine che appare solo due volte nella Bibbia ebraica), *maššā'* di H.-P. Müller, *nā'as* di L. Ruppert e *nābī'*, nuovamente di H.-P. Müller, *nādar* di O. Kaiser, *nākar* di B. Lang, *na'ar* di H. F. Fuhs, *nefeš* di H. Seebass. Importanti sul piano teologico sono invece, tra gli altri, *māšah* di K. Seybold, *mošeh* di H. Cazelles, *nābal* di J. Marbock, *nābī'* di H.-P. Müller. In altri casi invece le voci si prestano ad osservazioni, talvolta a critiche: *nāgīd* di G. F. Hasel, dove sembra dubbia l'impostazione essenzialmente sincronica invece che diacronica, *naweh* di H. Ringgren, dove meritava un trattamento la denominazione di Giosuè nei LXX e nella Vg rispettivamente come *ὁἰός Ναυη* e *filius Nun* o, appunto, *Nave*. La voce *nāhal* di E. Lipinski viene sempre tradotta con «eredità» e derivati, anche se tra virgolette; ma quando indica il «possesso», non sarebbe più giusto tradurre appunto questo termine? Che senso ha, per es., tradurre per la Terra santa l'«eredità di Jhwh»? Eredità è infatti una parola che indica sempre il trasferimento dei diritti di un defunto ad un successore da lui designato ovvero stabilito per legge, il che per Jhwh evidentemente il testo non ha voluto dire! Nella voce *'ibrī* di D. N. Freedman e B. E. Willoughby non appare il fondamentale articolo di M. Liverani, «Il fuoruscitismo in Siria nella tarda età del bronzo», *Rivista storica italiana* 77 (1975) 315-336, di cui un ampio sunto è apparso sulla *ZAW*, e dal quale risulta che il *ḥab/piru* o *'prm*, così spesso collegati col termine biblico, sono dei fuorusciti. Già da tempo si sapeva però che si trattava non già di un nucleo etnico, ma di una classe sociale, fuori e dentro Israele. Che il termine si richiama ad *'Eber* di Gen 10,24 è possibile, ma non dimostrato e nemmeno probabile (c. 1041); né sembra accettabile, neanche sul piano ipotetico, la proposta formulata a suo tempo da W. F. Albright, di collegare il termine con *'āpār*, «polvere», per cui avremmo a che fare con i «polverosi», i «viandanti», i «migranti». Ed è possibile, allo stato attuale delle ricerche, considerare ancora Gen 14,13 come l'«attestazione più antica» (c. 1047) del termine? È possibile, ancora, considerare lo «schiavo ebreo» come distinto dagli altri schiavi per ragioni etniche (c. 1050)? I testi sono tutti esilici e postesilici, per cui si fa meglio a pensare a ragioni teologiche. E possiamo oggi ancora parlare della formazione dello Stato israelita da parte

dei discendenti di Abramo, Isacco e Giacobbe, «fondato sull'alleanza al Sinai» (c. 1054)? Un'affermazione come questa, che semplifica un problema complesso, suona arcaica allo stato attuale delle ricerche!

Non c'è bisogno di dire che attendiamo i fascicoli seguenti con ansia comprensibile.

Via Pietro Cossa, 42
I-00193 Roma

J. A. SOGGIN

Novum Testamentum

José CABA, *Resucitó Cristo, mi esperanza*. Estudio exegético (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 475). xxxii-407 p. 20 × 12,5. Madrid 1986. Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Of the many approaches to the resurrection of Christ none is more sure-footed than the exegetical, and all are useful to the extent that they are based on the sound and solid exegesis of the biblical texts. The present work combines two naturally allied approaches, the exegetical and the theological, allotting the majority of its space to the former and thereby more solidly grounding the latter. It is precisely for this reason that the general reader can derive a great deal of information from the exegesis even while being challenged by its theological conclusions. On the other hand, the professional exegete or theologian can well afford to undertake a critique of the work, without thereby detracting from its worth or questioning its value.

J. Caba's book is itself the last of a trilogy on fundamental theology, where the first two volumes, *De los evangelios al Jesús histórico* (2nd ed., 1980) and *El Jesús de los evangelios* (1977), took up the question first of christology and then of the gospels and the Jesus of history. They thus prepared the grounds for the inevitable discussion of the resurrection. The present volume itself falls into three well-argued and clearly presented parts, making it a useful textbook worthy of the many that preceded it under the now celebrated B.A.C. imprint.

The first part consists of a survey of the major recent opinions on the resurrection of Jesus. Its principal aim is, of course, to present the main problems encountered whenever anyone attempts to analyze the data and to reflect upon the event of the resurrection. Among the authors that claim attention in the survey are M. Goguel, R. Bultmann, W. Marxsen, X. Léon-Dufour and W. Pannenberg. In each case, the merits of the exegesis are recognized, and the limitations of its presuppositions are defined. In his discussion of Pannenberg, C. observes rightly (p. 77) that, in order to subsist, faith needs the reality of what it believes. Faith itself, however, would be quite extinguished were this need for a reality always to require a historical dimension. There is a type of Western religious mentality that not only identifies the real with the historical but insists on historical verifiability as

the grounds of its faith. It is just such a mentality which persists in regarding, for instance, the Genesis accounts of creation or the New Testament resurrection narratives as historically verifiable facts.

The bulk of C.'s work, however, is devoted to the exegesis of the biblical texts; and Part Two begins with the fundamental text in 1 Cor 15,3-8, which has an arguable claim to being the earliest credal formula in the New Testament. But, precisely because of its credal nature, one has to distinguish the historically verifiable fact from the faith interpretation of that fact. Thus, while the "Christ died" is clearly a verifiably historical fact, the "for our sins" is just as clearly an interpretation of that fact, i.e., a statement of faith which cannot be subject to verifiability save perhaps only in the lived-out response of the believer. Conversely, the "he appeared" is a statement of verifiable fact—however one may wish to define this fact —, while the "he was raised" is an interpretation possible only to the one who believes in the resurrection of the dead. For, as Acts 10,40-41 states, God made the risen Christ "manifest, not to all the people but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses"; and Paul himself, with still more theological specificity affirms, "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised" (1 Cor 15,13). In other words, in order that those privileged with an appearance of the risen Jesus be able to recognize what they "saw" as the "risen Christ" they need to have had prior faith in the resurrection of the dead, since the experience, in and of itself, is open to several interpretations (as, e.g., Matt 27,64; 28,12-14; John 20,15; 21,7,12).

In what C. characterizes as the second "reflexión teológica" in the Corinthians texts, the "in accordance with the scriptures", there is a further theological component which also deserves greater attention. This constant theme of "according to the scriptures" is the key to understanding the New Testament christologies as well as a pointer to the genesis of the Easter faith. The references to "the law and the prophets" throughout the New Testament are not so much the "proof texts" of the weighty christological affirmations about Jesus of Nazareth, but their source and premise. So too, in the credal formulation of 1 Cor 15, the function of the "in accordance with the scriptures" is foundational rather than probative. It is at the basis of the disciples' faith in the resurrection and not the proof of its validity (see p. 103).

In the subsequent four chapters, C. takes up the resurrection narratives in each of the Gospels, starting with Mark. In the treatment of the seemingly apocopated final chapter of this Gospel with its noticeable lack of resurrection appearances, one point in particular predominates, as it also does throughout the whole of C.'s analysis: the empty tomb. Now all that the empty tomb could *necessarily* signify is that the tomb was empty, every other statement beyond this being an interpretation. It is not just that the empty tomb is, as Matthew knows full well, open to false interpretations, but that it is, by the very nature of the case, a fact allowing a multiplicity of assorted interpretations ranging all the way from fraud to faith. If, in the mind of first-century Palestine, the empty tomb could be spoken of as the "realidad controlable" (p. 155), then a Christian in our century should inquire whether the empty tomb makes any difference one way or another to faith in the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth.

In his exegesis of all four Gospels, the author follows a clear and—to the student in particular—a highly useful procedure. He not only situates a given text and exegetes it, but is also careful to indicate its links with the larger whole and to highlight the continuity of its principal themes with those already elaborated in the accounts of the public ministry. Each section of the Gospel accounts is, moreover, set out in a schematic—usually concentric—structure. This procedure is bound to be of help to most readers. But it is to the author's credit that he does not use the proposed structures as arguments but as aids to comprehension, much as they must have been originally used in a more oral method of transmission.

In keeping with the aim of the volume, the exegesis of each pericope is followed by an analysis of the theological content of its paschal message. In the overall plan of the trilogy, this procedure cannot but be a valuable aid to understanding, not only each evangelist's approach to the Jesus of history, but also a substantial segment of what we generally refer to as New Testament christology. Thus, for example, in the discussion of the Lucan account of the paschal christophany, C. underlines the apologetic trust of Luke 24,36-43 in its insistence upon the "realidad corporal" of the risen. This, of course, sheds light on Luke's own aim and purpose. It also furnishes us with a clue to the understanding of the christophanies in general, since the accounts of the appearances are more illustrations of the reality of the risen life than reasons for faith in the resurrection.

In his treatment of the Gospel of John, C. contends with both John 20 and John 21. In the account of the appearance to Mary Magdalene in John 20,1-18 we have a good illustration of two indispensable premises for any understanding of the Easter experiences: the ambivalence of the evidence of the empty tomb and, more importantly still, the need for a revelation to interpret it. The former is well illustrated by Mary's "If you have carried him away" (20,15); for the empty tomb, far from being adequate as a demonstration of the resurrection and far from having a necessary connection with faith in the risen Jesus (see p. 238), is ambiguous at best. The resurrection is a fact that requires divine revelation; and the whole account of John 20 is a demonstration of the Revealer *par excellence* carrying out this revelatory task. Neither the empty tomb nor the actual "seeing" of the risen is adequate or sufficient. You need a revelation, "the Lord is risen", to interpret both one and the other. C., however, is right to underline the link between John 20 and John 10,3 and 27 (p. 241): the calling of the sheep by name and their hearing the voice of the shepherd. The fundamental dialectic of revelation and response throughout the Fourth Gospel is thus admirably illustrated in the most moving of its paschal christophanies.

In the discussion of the appearance in John 21, the author's care to establish the links between this second concluding chapter and chapter 20 serves to clarify the purpose of the narrative. The link with Luke 5, however, is not made clear in this chapter, nor sufficiently discussed elsewhere. The importance of this link lies, not merely in the different redactional uses to which a piece of tradition about Jesus can be put, but in the importance of mission—as C. himself rightly points out—as a component part of the resurrection appearances. Thus the option to situate the miraculous catch of

fish in the course of the public ministry in Luke 5 rather than after Easter in John 21 cannot but be theologically significant, since the understanding of both the Easter mystery and the mission of the apostles is thereby affected.

The careful and detailed exegesis in the second part of C.'s book provides the basis for the theological considerations of its final part. In Mark's angelic message "He has risen, he is not here" (16,6), as also in Matthew 28,6, the angel — clearly a figure from apocalyptic—fulfills the hermeneutic role of interpreting the empty tomb. In Luke and in John, however, the risen Lord himself assumes this role. The presupposition of this revelatory component in the narratives is that the resurrection is an object of revelation and, therefore, not susceptible of proof but only of acceptance by faith. The appearances themselves do not constitute a "verdadera prueba" (p. 315). In their relation to faith, they are neither a sufficient condition for, nor a necessary consequence of faith. In this regard, they are like the miracles in the Gospels, whether in the Synoptics where they require faith, or in John where they occasion it. But both in the Synoptics and in John the point is their ultimate inadequacy. The "Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe" (John 20,29) is fundamental to Christian faith in the person and the work of Jesus, whether in the Fourth Gospel or anywhere else in the New Testament.

C. is quite right to insist on the identity of the risen Lord with the Jesus of Nazareth in all the Gospel accounts. This identity risks being overlooked in much of today's theologizing. Indeed the appearances themselves are not so much "proofs" of the resurrection as illustrations of the reality of the risen life. Nevertheless, whatever the nature of the experience which the witnesses described as "seeing" the risen Jesus, one cannot overlook the fact that what they "saw" was the risen "Lord", and this by definition is an eschatological, other-worldly reality, not available to direct earthly sight. Therefore, the encounter with the Jesus who was crucified, died, and was buried, whatever form it takes in the New Testament, requires the revelation of "he is risen". The response to this revelation can only be faith. Hence, the mission to "go and tell the brethren". For, like all biblical revelation, the "he is risen" does not terminate in the privileged recipient but in the mission to proclaim the resurrection. Neither the reliability of the witnesses, nor the appearances themselves, nor the empty tomb are conclusive proof of the resurrection. In and of themselves, they are capable of a variety of interpretations: psychological, physiological, social, spiritual, and even political. This is why C. is right to remark that a "literal" interpretation of the accounts is "desaconsejado" (p. 324). This is not merely a matter of right exegetical method, but of the right understanding of eschatological reality.

Finally, when the author takes up the significance of the resurrection for the believer, he is careful to single out the "new creative action of God" (pp. 347f.). For, when Paul reminds the Romans that the God in whom we believe is he who "gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist" (Rom 4,17), he is expressing by means of a parallelism the fact that the resurrection is an act of creation. Those who believe in the risen Christ must believe in him as the "victor mortis"; and, precisely because they still have to contemplate their own inevitable mortality, they need

the constant proclamation of the word in the church that he who is risen is the reason for "our hope", a hope that "will not disappoint" precisely because the author of the risen life is none other than God the Creator.

3 Phillips Place
Cambridge, MA 02138
U.S.A.

Stanley B. MARROW

Robert C. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. A Literary Interpretation. Volume 1: The Gospel According to Luke (Foundations and Facets: New Testament). xv-334 p. 24 x 15,5. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

This is volume one of a projected two volume work by the Fred Gealy Professor of New Testament at the Methodist Theological School in Delaware, Ohio, USA. He is known from his earlier *The Sword of His Mouth* (1975), his chairing of the Pronouncement Story working group within The Society of Biblical Literature, and his editing of *Semeia* 20 (1981), on the Pronouncement Story in antiquity.

The context for this volume and its promised companion is the ferment going on in the North American study of the gospels generally and of Luke-Acts in particular. Exactly how should one read/study a gospel? The traditional answer is typified by Joseph A. Fitzmyer's two volume commentary on Luke in the Anchor Bible Series (1981, 1985). That one of the earliest American reviewers voiced dissatisfaction with the very way the commentary was constructed (It leads one through the maze of secondary literature but not into the text as a religious document. So H. H. Oliver, *Christian Century* 99 [1982] 65-67) reflected the changed angle of vision among many, especially those associated with the SBL's Luke-Acts Group (1974-78; see *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, 1978) and Luke-Acts Seminar (1979-83; see *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the SBL Seminar*, 1983).

At four points the differences between the traditional and the recent approaches are visible. (1) Traditionally the units studied are roughly equivalent to the pericopes of a traditional Gospel Synopsis/Parallels. Of late there is a concern to examine larger thought units within the Gospel, as these can be discerned from indications within the Gospel text and from analogies from the milieu. (2) The earlier approach, using a Synopsis, involved careful scrutiny of every variant between the Lukan text and an alleged earlier source (usually thought to be Mark and Q). The later tendency has been to start with the continuous text of the Gospel and to do a close reading of it as a finished product by either rhetorical criticism (as that term is used by students of James Muilenberg) or modern narrative criticism (of whatever variety). Then a Synopsis is used to compare Luke with the other Gospels, which are viewed not as alleged sources so much as independent develop-

ments of the same basic tradition. (3) The end sought in the earlier approach is basically a history of the tradition, including not only the pre-gospel stages of the church's transmission but also the question of the historical Jesus. The later trend has been to look for a message of the text in its canonical form. The earlier method uses the Gospel as a window through which to see something else (the development of the tradition); the later as a mirror reflecting its own narrative world. (4) Whereas the dialogue partners of Lukan scholars operating out of a traditional methodology were usually Conzelmann and his colleagues, those belonging to the recent trend seek to dialogue with modern literary critics and with ancient Mediterranean literature, Greco-Roman and Hellenistic Jewish. One of the first expressions of the newer approach to Luke is C. H. Talbert's *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York 1982). Tannehill's work belongs to the same current in North American scholarship.

In Tannehill's volume Luke-Acts is approached as a unified narrative. The concern is not with individual texts as isolated data but as functional members of the total narrative. Although T. thinks the two source theory is correct (p. 6, n. 3), he regards it as irrelevant for interpretation. The focus of the book is on Luke-Acts in its finished form. It aims at meaning that is emphasized strongly and is supported by clear literary signals. T. wants to highlight what the narrator is highlighting through the literary design of the work. The method used is termed "narrative criticism". The author has, however, tried to avoid the technical terms of literary theory. The end sought is neither a history of traditions nor a set of theological propositions but rather a tracing of the Lukan narrative within the Lukan narrative world. The agenda is set not by Conzelmann and his reconstruction but by a methodological stance strongly influenced by modern, non-biblical literary criticism.

Tannehill's thesis is that the author of Luke-Acts consciously understands the story of Jesus and his followers as unified by the controlling purpose of God (Luke 7,30; Acts 2,23; 4,28; 5,38-39; 13,36; 20,27). Luke-Acts has a unified plot because there is a unifying purpose of God behind the events which are narrated, and the mission of Jesus and his witnesses represents that purpose being carried out through human action. There is a persistent tension within the plot, however, caused by repeated rejection of the message. The story, therefore, emerges as a dialogue between God and a recalcitrant humanity.

Tannehill's plan uses the first three chapters to set up the Gospel's focus on God's will unfolding in the missions of John the Baptist and Jesus. Already the readers can anticipate that the story will concern God's comprehensive saving purpose as it encounters human rejection. The next four chapters explore the variety of human responses to God's will as that is seen in Jesus' relations with various groups: the oppressed and excluded (chapter 4); the crowd (chapter 5); the authorities (chapter 6); and the disciples (chapter 7). The final chapter focuses on the resurrection traditions and their narrative functions: review and preview, closure and openness (chapter 8).

What sets this book apart from most others is its methodological approach to the Lukan Gospel. It is, therefore, on Tannehill's method that any

review ought to focus. Let us begin with a clarification. T's approach is closer to the old "New Criticism" which focused on the text as an organic unity whose meaning was discerned by tracing the interconnections of its parts than it is to the newer "Narrative Criticism" which focuses on narrator, implied reader, narrative time, etc., as in R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia 1983). Although T. pays lip service to the latter approach, his own tack is that of New Criticism. This type of close reading is invaluable. Since, when non-biblical literary critics were reading texts from a perspective derived from New Criticism, biblical critics were continuing an historical reading of the Bible, T's work represents an advance that is late in coming.

The very strength of Tannehill's literary method is its weakness. By focusing almost totally on the interconnections of this particular text, the method tends to abstract it from its original time and place and to yield a timeless, self-contained entity. There is, for example, in this study an almost total lack of references to Mediterranean sources outside the Bible. Since T's work with the Pronouncement Story Group of SBL guarantees his knowledge of such materials, one must chalk their neglect up to his methodology. Such neglect of Greco-Roman and Hellenistic Jewish materials undermines much that T. tries to do. Two examples will suffice.

If his aim is to highlight what the narrator is highlighting through his literary design of the work (p. 5), his effort is vitiated by neglect of comparative materials. T. misses the literary unity of Luke 1,5-4,15. Instead he is apparently victim of his Gospel Synopsis that sets the birth narratives off from what follows because the Triple Tradition begins at Luke 3. If T. had supplemented the signals within the text by comparative materials which show 1,5-4,15 to belong to the genre of the pre-public career of a hero in antiquity, he would have transcended the traditional dependence on a Synopsis. The fact is: an interpreter cannot accurately discern the pattern of the Third Gospel without assistance from Greco-Roman and Hellenistic Jewish sources of the period. It is not enough to focus totally within the text.

More serious is the problem with evaluating the type of meaning encountered in the text. Without the assistance of comparative materials, T. is not able to identify Luke's meaning adequately. He argues that Luke's plot is unified because there is a unifying purpose of God behind the events which are narrated, and the mission of Jesus and his witnesses represents that purpose through human actions in spite of human rejection. The question that must be put is this. Is this correctly-identified purpose of God which lies behind the events of Luke's narrative the background against which the Evangelist paints his portrait(s), or is it itself the foreground?

Knowledge of the Mediterranean milieu forces this question upon the interpreter. In antiquity it was widely believed that a divine necessity controlled human history, shaping the course of its events. Polybius, for example, believed a divine providence ruled the world. This belief he expounded in his *Histories*. Nevertheless, this was only the backdrop against which he pursued his dual purpose: (a) providing useful training and experience for the practical politician (e.g., 3.6.6ff.), and (b) teaching the reader how to bear the vicissitudes of Fortune by describing what had befallen others (e.g., 1.35-36;

2.35.5ff.). Moreover, Josephus' *Antiquities* share in this cultural belief, although as a Jew he would have viewed the divine necessity as deriving from the personal will of God who is a living person and not a neutral necessity (e.g., 10.8.2-3 § 142). Nevertheless, this was but the background against which he pursued his aim: to legitimate the Jews by an appeal to their antiquity. So when T. tells us that Luke-Acts' narrative is a working out of the purpose/will of God, one must ask in return: What aim is the author pursuing against this background? All T. has told us so far is that the author of Luke-Acts shares the common Mediterranean belief in history's unfolding according to divine necessity. Using only his literary method that focuses only on the interrelationships of the parts within the text as a whole, T. is not aware of just how limited his vision of Luke's message really is. Without the use of comparative materials from Mediterranean antiquity to supplement his literary reading, Tannehill's work is seriously flawed.

Perhaps the question which all those who practice narrative criticism must answer is: What is the extra pay-off from the use of such a method? What can you tell us that we do not already know from other methods? If it is a narrative criticism divorced from a careful use of comparative materials from Greco-Roman antiquity, the answer must be: "Not much". Moreover, is it not ironic that as biblical scholars influenced by non-biblical literary criticism begin to emphasize the organic unity of the biblical texts, much recent literary criticism seems intent on denying the very organic unity of literary texts that biblical scholars seek to affirm?

Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109
U.S.A.

Charles H. TALBERT

Varia

Carol NEWSOM, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27). xii-476 p. XIX Plates. Atlanta 1985. Scholars Press.

En el congreso de la IOSOT celebrado en Oxford en el verano de 1959 J. Strugnell presentó por vez primera dos fragmentos de una composición himnica proveniente de Qumrán a la que dio el título de «Regla de los Cán- ticos del sacrificio sabático» («The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran. 4QSerek Šîrôt 'Olat Haš-šabāt» en *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* [VTS 7; Leiden 1960] 318-345). Uno de los fragmentos permitía una primera ojeada a las especula- ciones sobre la liturgia angélica; el otro levantaba una parte del velo que cubría las elucubraciones sobre el carro divino. La sensación fue grande y el influjo de los fragmentos aún mayor. La búsqueda renovada de las antiguas raíces del misticismo judío, las polémicas sobre los componentes pre-gnósti-

cos del Judaísmo del Segundo Templo, el nuevo interés por la literatura de los *Hekalot*, por citar algunos de los campos en los que ávidamente fueron escrutados estos nuevos textos, testimonian del impacto de la comunicación de Strugnell. Pero a pesar del interés despertado habría que esperar hasta el año 1982 para poder conocer más ampliamente el contenido de esta obra fascinante. En ese año A.S. van der Woude publicaba los magros restos de una copia de la obra encontrada en la Cueva 11 de Qumrán («Fragmente einer Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Hohle XI von Qumran (11QŠirŠabb)» en *Von Kanaan bis Kerala* [AOAT 211; Neukirchen-Kevelaer 1982] 311-377) y C. Newsom defendía en Harvard su tesis doctoral dirigida por Strugnell en la que daba a conocer seis copias de la obra provenientes de la Cueva 4 de Qumrán. En 1984 fue publicado el ejemplar encontrado en Masada (C. Newsom and Y. Yadin, «The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice», *IEJ* 34 [1984] 77-88). La obra que ahora presentamos completa este proceso editorial y ofrece juntos todos los materiales existentes de estos Cánticos del Sacrificio Sabático (*ŠirŠabb*) en espera de su publicación definitiva en la serie DJD.

La autora, en efecto, publica de nuevo en ella las seis copias que había estudiado en su tesis, la copia de 11Q y la proveniente de Masada, y añade otras dos copias (4Q402 y 4Q407) previamente desconocidas. Cada uno de estos MSS es provisto de una descripción, análisis ortográfico y paleográfico, transcripción, traducción y comentario. Una amplia introducción general, una concordancia y 19 planchas de buena calidad conteniendo los textos completan el volumen.

A pesar de la abundancia de las copias y de la amplitud de algunos de los fragmentos no es una tarea fácil el describir el contenido de la obra. Está formada por una serie de himnos que contienen las alabanzas que las distintas clases de ángeles pronuncian en el templo celeste. Cada uno de estos cánticos comienza con una fórmula de introducción fija en la que se determina: el autor o el destinatario del salmo: «del/para el Instructor»; la finalidad del cántico: «Cántico para el sacrificio del sábado»; la fecha para el que la composición está destinada: «sábado X del mes X». En el cuerpo de estos cánticos, por cuanto puede deducirse de los restos conservados, se trata:

- del establecimiento del sacerdocio angélico y de sus funciones (Sab. 1)
- de las relaciones entre el sacerdocio angélico y el terrestre (Sab. 2)
- de la guerra celeste (Sab. 5)
- de las bendiciones proferidas por los siete príncipes angélicos (Sab. 6)
- de las alabanzas de los distintos elementos del templo celeste, culminando en las alabanzas de los carros divinos (Sab. 7)
- de las bendiciones proferidas por los siete sub-jefes angélicos (Sab. 8)
- de las alabanzas de los distintos elementos del templo celeste (Sab. 9)
- del santuario (*debir*) celeste (Sab. 10)
- del trono o carro (*merkabah*) celeste (Sab. 12)
- del culto celeste (Sab. 13).

Como aparece de este resumen del contenido de *ShirShabb*, la obra es aún más variada y rica de lo que los primeros fragmentos conocidos hacían suponer; su conservación, sin embargo, es mucho más defectuosa de lo que la multiplicidad de copias conservadas permitían esperar. El cuidado y el esfuerzo desplegado por Newsom en su edición es admirable y su decisión de intentar extraer el máximo partido posible de todos los fragmentos es digna de todo elogio. Tanto los análisis de detalle como la discusión de los problemas generales han sido efectuados con un cuidado y una precisión extrema y la obra ocupará sin duda alguna un lugar privilegiado en las discusiones de los problemas qumránicos de los próximos años. Su valor es aún más grande gracias a la inclusión de una concordancia completa de todos los textos de *ShirShabb*.

Puesto que el Prof. E. Puech en su recensión de la obra que será publicada en la *RB* y en un artículo que aparecerá en la *RevQ* ha analizado detalladamente los aspectos paleográficos y las lecturas de los MSS de Newsom y que el Prof. E. Qimron (según me informa amablemente el Prof. Strugnell) ha estudiado los aspectos lingüísticos de los textos en un trabajo que será publicado en *HTR* me ha parecido conveniente concentrar mi recensión en tres de los problemas que plantea la Introducción General vistos a la luz de los cambios que pueden apreciarse entre la thesis de Newsom de 1982 y la publicación definitiva de 1985.

Estos cambios son abundantes y significativos. Algunos de ellos son cambios menores, como ligeras modificaciones en las traducciones de los textos, correcciones de errores como el del cálculo de la extensión de la primera línea de 4Q400, cambios de opinión en cuanto a la datación relativa de MSS (4Q405 es considerado ahora como «slightly later than 4Q400» en vez de «distinctly earlier than 4Q400»), nuevas lecturas, nuevas interpretaciones (por ejemplo, la importancia dada a la posible mención de Melquisedec en 4Q401), simplificación de las descripciones paleográficas de los MSS, etc. En otros casos, sin embargo, se trata de modificaciones substanciales tanto en las hipótesis de comprensión de *ShirShabb* como en la ordenación, presentación e interpretación de ciertos MSS (sobre todo 4Q405).

Buena parte de los cambios menores son debidos a la incorporación de elementos provenientes del estudio de las otras copias de *ShirShabb* de 11Q y de Masada así como de los otros diversos materiales de 4Q publicados por Baillet en DJD VII. Los cambios más importantes son debidos, como la autora confiesa, a la aplicación del método desarrollado por H. Stegemann para ordenar fragmentos aislados en una secuencia que podría corresponder al orden que los diversos fragmentos ocupaban en los MSS originales y a las consecuencias en cuanto a la extensión, contenido y estructura de *ShirShabb* que se deducen de la ordenación consecutiva de los distintos fragmentos de cada copia (la descripción de este método, presentada por Stegemann en un Simposio en Nueva York en 1984 no ha sido aún publicada, pero gracias a su amabilidad he podido disponer de una copia de su manuscrito para controlar el trabajo de Newsom).

En los tres puntos que aquí estudiaremos las conclusiones a las que la autora llega se revelan en último análisis como las más probables, aunque tal vez algo menos ciertas de lo que su presentación indica. Pero puesto que yo

estoy convencido de que la obra de Newsom ocupará, y muy merecidamente, un lugar definitivo junto a los volúmenes de la serie DJD en las bibliotecas de todos los biblistas interesados en los MSS de Qumrán, no será tal vez del todo inútil el poner de relieve los elementos de incerteza que, a pesar de todo, aún subsisten en nuestra comprensión de la obra.

Número de Cánticos en ShirShabb

Una de las consecuencias importantes de la aplicación de este método es la posibilidad de determinar dentro de ciertos límites la distancia entre un determinado fragmento y el final (o el comienzo, según la forma en la que fue enrollado) de un determinado MS fundándose en características puramente materiales como la distancia entre los indicios secuenciales de destrucción conservados. Esto permite calcular el número de columnas desaparecidas entre ese fragmento y el final (o el comienzo) del MS original. La aplicación de este criterio a 4Q405 y a 11QShirShabb lleva a Newsom a precisar que entre 4Q405 23 ii y el final de este MS solo ha podido desaparecer una columna de texto y que el conjunto formado por los fragmentos 2-1-9 contendría el final de 11QShirShabb. Puesto que 4Q405 23 i-ii contiene restos de los Cánticos 12 y 13 y 11QShirShabb el final de Cántico 13, Newsom concluye que la obra original contenía 13 composiciones y no 52 como Strugnell había supuesto y como ella misma había defendido en las pp. 4-5 de su tesis.

Esta conclusión es importante y condiciona inevitablemente la manera de comprender la obra, su finalidad, su estructura interna, etc. Personalmente yo estoy persuadido de que esta conclusión de Newsom es la conclusión correcta a pesar de que los argumentos que ella emplea para probarla no me parecen completamente convincentes. En mi opinión el método desarrollado por Stegemann permite concluir con una relativa confianza que del final de 4Q405 solo se ha perdido una columna. La aplicación del mismo método a 11QShirShabb, sin embargo, no permite deducir que la col. E (frag. 2-1-9) es la última del MS. Los contornos de destrucción («shape of damage») del frag. 9 exigirían una ordenación distinta de la que la autora propone, y el mismo criterio llevaría a separar el frag. 7 de su posición actual. La aplicación coherente del método de Stegemann llevaría consigo una ordenación distinta de los elementos que Newsom considera como restos del Cántico 13 y, lo que es más importante, la ordenación en columnas *consecutivas* de los frag. 5-6, 8-7 y 2-1-9 que exige la hipótesis me parece incompatible con las correspondencias que Newsom señala con el texto de 4Q405. Como indicaciones materiales seguras solo nos queda la evidencia de 4Q405 y no se debe olvidar que incluso la identificación del frag. 23 con los Cánticos 12 y 13 se funda en indicios circunstanciales y no en evidencia directa, como lo es la identificación del frag. 20-21-22 con el Cántico 12.

El segundo de los argumentos de Newsom es de tipo estadístico: Vista la abundancia de copias de la obra y las numerosas correspondencias entre los distintos MSS y el hecho de que todos los restos conservados pertenecen a los Cánticos de los 13 primeros sábados del año, es muy improbable suponer que si existieron otros MSS con los cánticos para los demás sábados estos han desaparecido completamente. La conclusión es correcta, pero su solidez

depende evidentemente de la prueba de las premisas. Visto el carácter repetitivo de la lengua empleada y lo fragmentario de buen número de las correspondencias entre los distintos MSS no me parece fuera de lugar el relativizar tanto las correspondencias entre determinadas expresiones como la atribución de ciertos fragmentos a Cánticos concretos. Para que el argumento de Newsom fuera completamente convincente la autora debería: 1) explicar por qué, si la obra completa contenía únicamente 13 Cánticos, su autor decidió emplear en las introducciones una fórmula que relaciona los Cánticos con un ciclo anual y no trimestral; 2) probar que las fórmulas de introducción conservadas se refieren *todas* a estos primeros 13 sábados. Newsom reconoce que fue precisamente el tipo de fórmula empleado en las introducciones el que dio origen a la hipótesis de los 52 Cánticos, pero no ofrece una explicación convincente de su uso en la hipótesis de los 13 Cánticos. Además se ve obligada a suponer una variante en la fórmula de introducción (que es constante en todos los otros casos) en 4Q401 1-2 para poder encuadrar este Cántico dentro de la hipótesis de 13 composiciones (*bhdš* en vez de *lhdš*; ver el distinto tratamiento del texto en la tesis, p. 163, y en el libro, p. 128). Es decir, que su nueva interpretación de la evidencia conservada está condicionada por la hipótesis, lo que le obliga a excluir que esta introducción concreta pueda corresponder a un sábado de una de las semanas entre la 21 y la 29 del año.

Estas observaciones no intentan probar el que *ShirShabb* constaba originalmente de 52 composiciones, ni mucho menos aún que estas composiciones correspondían a los 52 Cánticos que David habría compuesto para las ofrendas de los sábados (11QPs^a XXVII, 5-8), sino que pretenden únicamente reducir a proporciones más modestas y reales las bases de nuestro convencimiento. Para mí el elemento decisivo es de orden literario: la obra de 13 Cánticos que Newsom ha conseguido reconstruir en grandes líneas tiene una estructura interna tan coherente y tan fuertemente estructurada que me resulta difícil imaginar que no sea un todo completo sino únicamente parte de un complejo superior.

Secuencia de fragmentos

Otra de las consecuencias importantes de la aplicación del método de Stegemann es la ordenación consecutiva de los fragmentos reflejando el orden en que habrían debido encontrarse los MSS originales. Newsom confiesa que «after working with Harmut Stegemann on the proper ordering of the manuscript fragments according to their position and sequence in the original form of the scrolls, it seemed to me that a numbering system which reflected the order of the contents of the document as preserved in the extant manuscripts would be a more helpful way of organizing and presenting the material» (p. 467). El principio es irreproachable. La posible confusión con la numeración establecida en su tesis queda resuelta con la tabla de equivalencias de las pp. 467-468 y con la lista publicada por Carmignac en la *RevQ* 46 [1986] 185. En definitiva el libro de Newsom constituye una especie de *editio princeps* de *ShirShabb* y la autora tiene perfecto derecho a establecer el sistema de numeración de fragmentos que le parezca el más adecuado. El problema es que Newsom emplea tres sistemas distintos de numeración (lo que no faci-

lita las cosas) y que no es consecuente con el principio explícitamente establecido de numeración según el orden supuesto en los MSS originales. En la mayoría de los casos Newsom atribuye un solo número a los fragmentos aislados o a los grupos de fragmentos que los contactos materiales permiten considerar como una unidad; pero en ocasiones (por ejemplo, 4Q401 14; 4Q404 2. 4) da un solo número a frag. distintos cuya posición respectiva, más o menos próxima, le parece asegurada por motivos internos o por la correspondencia con otras copias, mientras que en otros casos del mismo tipo (por ejemplo, 4Q400 3. 5; 4Q401 1. 2; 4Q405 20-21-22) mantiene una numeración distinta, y en otros más (por ejemplo, 4Q404 3AB; 4Q405 3AB. 7AB-CDE. 8AB. 11AB. 19ABCD) emplea un sistema mixto en el que cada letra corresponde a un fragmento que formaría parte del conjunto designado con el número. El empleo de los tres métodos en un mismo MSS como 4Q405 no ayuda a la claridad de la presentación.

Más importante (en cuanto que hace aún más confuso un texto que de por sí no es nada claro) me parece el fallo de la autora en aplicar consecuentemente el principio de numerar los frag. según la reconstrucción que ella propone. Para 4Q400 Newsom sugiere reconstruir tres columnas sucesivas con los frag. 1 // 3-5-4 // 2. Aunque la agrupación de los frag. 3-5-4 en una columna presenta ciertas dificultades como la diferente distancia entre líneas del frag. 5 con relación a los otros, podemos aceptar que esta reconstrucción es «very plausible» (p. 87); ¿porqué pues no ha adaptado la numeración a la hipótesis? Idéntico es el caso de 4Q401: el frag. 15 contendría restos del Cántico del primer sábado, el frag. 14 probablemente del segundo, y el frag. 1-2 (en su interpretación) habría preservado la introducción del Cántico del cuarto sábado. ¿Porqué no haberlos numerado consecuentemente?

Es notable que en el caso de 4Q400 la ordenación en columnas consecutivas se basa únicamente en criterios de contenido. Coordinar estos resultados con los que se obtendrían aplicando a este texto el método de Stegemann me parece una tarea imposible, lo que en cierto modo relativiza la validez del método. Idéntica relativización resulta del examen de su aplicación a 4Q402. Incluso con la mejor voluntad es imposible ver la «congruity of shape» en los márgenes derechos de los frag. 3 y 4 de las planchas publicadas. Las afirmaciones de Newsom de la p. 148 permanecen incomprensibles, a menos de suponer que los fragmentos que ella compara tienen una forma distinta de la que reflejan dichas planchas. Que este es el caso, parece poder deducirse de la referencia en la p. 155 a una fotografía anterior en la que parte de las líneas 9-11 del frag. 4 aún no habían sido unidas al fragmento y que efectivamente presenta una «congruity of shape» con el frag. 3, revelando al mismo tiempo la fragilidad del método. Incluso en el ejemplo en el que el método proporciona los mejores resultados (4Q405) su aplicación no está exenta de problemas. Así, los «parallel vertical cracks» de los frag. 22-23 me parecen igualmente perceptibles en los frag. 17 y 18, pero en posiciones que parecen incompatibles con su colocación actual en la reconstrucción y, en todo caso, las marcas verticales que la autora señala en el frag. 19 se hallan a una distancia respectiva incompatible con la secuencia establecida en los frag. 22 y 23.

Como en el punto anteriormente examinado, yo creo que un buen núme-

ro de las secuencias de fragmentos establecidas por Newsom son correctas y que suponen un enorme progreso de cara a la comprensión del texto; pero también aquí es necesario reducir a proporciones más modestas la certeza de las conclusiones.

Orígenes qumránicos de ShirShabb

También en este aspecto la solución de Newsom me parece la correcta; pero también aquí se presentan problemas que la autora debería haber afrontado para poder justificar su opinión. En este caso además yo pienso que hay suficientes elementos como para considerar los orígenes qumránicos de *Shir-Shabb* no solo como una «working hypothesis» (p. 4) sino como un elemento razonablemente cierto.

La posición de la autora en cuanto a los orígenes qumránicos de *Shir-Shabb* no ha cambiado substancialmente entre la tesis y el libro, aunque ahora la presenta con nuevos argumentos y con contornos más definidos y precisos. La supresión del capítulo de la tesis sobre las relaciones de *ShirShabb* con la literatura de los *Hekalot* es significativa en este sentido, y aún lo es más su substitución en el libro por un capítulo sobre el «contexto qumránico de *ShirShabb*». Tanto este capítulo, posiblemente el más fascinante y mejor construido de toda la introducción, como el capítulo dedicado expresamente a estudiar la proveniencia de la obra dejan, sin embargo, en el aire una serie de cuestiones a las que sería necesario responder para poder admitir sin reservas el origen qumránico de la composición que la autora justamente defiende.

Newsom reconoce que la evidencia directa interna no es conclusiva. Pero su reducción del problema a la alternativa: obra qumránica u obra pre-qumránica solo será aceptada por aquellos que ven el multiforme contenido de las distintas Cuevas de Qumrán como un conjunto homogéneo que solo se explica en cuanto biblioteca de una comunidad sectaria. Quienes ven los materiales de la Cueva 4 como una amalgama de textos provenientes de Jerusalén y sin ninguna cohesión interna (N. Golb) o como reflejo del Judaísmo pluriforme de la época (L. Schiffman) no serán convencidos de que la alternativa es válida. Tanto menos cuanto que la presencia de una de las copias des *Shir-Shabb* en Masada es uno de los puntos de partida de Golb para cuestionar el consensus existente en cuanto a la vinculación entre los MSS de las Cuevas y la comunidad de Khirbet Qumrán. Es extraño que Newsom no haya discutido en detalle las implicaciones del hallazgo de la copia de Masada al tratar de la proveniencia de la obra, tanto más cuanto que el contexto qumránico que ella postula y especialmente su relación con el ritual de consagración o de rededicación de los sacerdotes en Qumrán está claramente fuera de lugar en el contexto de Masada. Es cierto que hay una notable diferencia entre las afirmaciones del artículo de *IEJ*, p. 77: «Historically, the discovery of this fragment of a Qumran work is significant because it implies the participation of members of the Qumran community, almost certainly to be identified with the Essenes, in the revolt against Rome», que parecen más bien reflejar las posiciones de Y. Yadin, y las afirmaciones más moderadas del libro, p. 74 n. 11: «The presence of a copy of the Shabbat Shirot at Masada is perhaps

best explained by assuming that it was taken there by a member of the Qumran community who participated in the revolt against Rome, presumably after the destruction of the community center at Khirbet Qumran». Pero otras explicaciones son igualmente posibles (por ejemplo la propuesta por G. Vermes en E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, Vol. III. 1 [Edinburgh 1986] 463), y en cualquier caso tanto estas explicaciones como el tomar en serio la posibilidad de un origen extra-qumránico son relevantes a la hora de estudiar la proveniencia de la obra.

Newsom considera como *posible* un origen pre-qumránico de *ShirShabb*, aunque menos *probable* que un origen qumránico. En mi opinión hay dos elementos que disminuyen la posibilidad de un origen pre-qumránico: la datación paleográfica de todas las copias encontradas y ciertas características lingüísticas del texto. Aunque el argumento paleográfico solo permite una datación de las copias, y esto solo dentro de ciertos límites, me parece significativo el que *todas* las 10 copias halladas de la obra pertenezcan al tipo de MSS tardíos (entre 50 a.C. y 50 d.C.), mientras que las copias de obras claramente pre-qumránicas como *1 Henoc* se escalonan a lo largo de los diferentes períodos de ocupación de Qumrán, con ejemplares que preceden incluso a la instalación de la comunidad en el Khirbert (lo mismo que sucede con los MSS bíblicos). El argumento lingüístico es igualmente de manejo difícil debido a nuestra ignorancia de la evolución del hebreo durante el período del Segundo Templo, pero una serie de innovaciones lexicales (ver las listas de palabras que no se encuentran en el hebreo bíblico en la tesis pp. 96-100, o mejor aún a efectos de comparación las listas establecidas por E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [HSS 29; Atlanta 1986] 88-115) y de características sintácticas (como la sobreabundancia de cláusulas nominales, el predominio de los infinitivos, la omnipresencia del empleo del *lamed*, etc.) parecen sugerir una fecha más bien tardía para la composición de *ShirShabb* (digamos, en el s. I a.C.), fecha que concuerda con la evidencia paleográfica. En mi opinión, cuanto más tardía es una de las obras encontradas en Qumrán, menor es la posibilidad de que sus orígenes sean pre-qumránicos y pueda provenir del movimiento en el que la secta hunde sus raíces.

Newsom emplea dos argumentos que hacen «a Qumran origin more likely» (pp. 2-4): el empleo en las fórmulas introductorias de *lmskyl* y las relaciones con 4QBerakot. El empleo característico de *lmskyl* en 1QS iii,13; 1QSB i,1; iii,22; v, 20 y especialmente el paralelo con 5Q511 2 i,1 y 8,4 (todos ellos textos claramente «sectarios») es un argumento de mucho peso y la identificación del *maskil* de los Cánticos con el funcionario de la Comunidad qumránica parece imponerse. El único punto en el que la autora no me parece completamente consecuente es en la decisión de traducir constantemente *lmskyl* por «by the Instructor», es decir, interpretando el *lamed* como un *lamed auctoris*, equivalente al *ldwd* de los Salmos, a pesar de admitir la posibilidad de que *lmskyl* puede igualmente ser interpretado como equivalente al *lmnsh* de los Salmos. Una traducción como la propuesta en *IEJ*, p. 80: «By/For the maskil» habría reflejado mejor la ambigüedad del texto, y una opción en favor de «Para el Instructor» habría sido más coherente con su correcta identificación del *maskil* con el funcionario de la Comunidad.

El segundo de sus argumentos (las relaciones entre *ShirShabb* y 4QBera-

kot) me parece igualmente probante. Pero para poder apreciar este argumento en toda su fuerza hay que esperar la publicación completa de 4QBerakot.

Esta espera será ahora menos penosa gracias a los esfuerzos de Newsom que nos han proporcionado una abundante cosecha de nuevos materiales con los que podremos comprender mejor la vida litúrgica de los «hijos de la luz» y las corrientes místicas que atravesaban la comunidad qumránica alimentando su comunión con el mundo angélico.

Qumrân Instituut
Universiteit de Groningen
Nieuwe Kijk in't Jastraat 104
9712 SL Groningen
Holanda

F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Deuxième Conférence Internationale Bible et Informatique: méthodes, outils, résultats Jérusalem, 9-13 Juin 1988

L'Association Internationale Bible et Informatique (AIBI) vous invite à participer au 2^{ème} Colloque International qu'elle organise à Jérusalem du 9 au 13 Juin 1988.

Après le colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve (Septembre 1985) qui avait pour thème «Bible et Informatique: le texte», les organisateurs voudraient attirer l'attention sur les méthodes, les outils et les résultats de la recherche automatisée sur les corpus du domaine biblique.

Veuillez adresser toute demande de renseignement à l'adresse suivante:

2^{ème} Colloque International
Association Internationale Bible et Informatique
c/o Centre: Informatique et Bible
B-5198 Denec - Belgique

Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense

The Thirty-eighth annual Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense will take place in Louvain, Belgium, from August 16 to 18, 1988, under the chairmanship of Professor Doctor Raymond F. Collins of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. The topic of this year's colloquium will be "The Thessalonian Correspondence".

Major papers on various aspects of these letters will be delivered by Professors Helmut Koester, Jan Lambrecht, Paul-Emile Langevin, Franz Laub, I. Howard Marshall, Joseph Plevnik, and others. Seminars will be conducted in four languages: in Dutch on the Resurrection in 1 Thess 4,3-18, in English on the Synoptic Tradition in the letters, in French on eschatology and rhetoric in 1 Thess, and in German on the partition theories.

Further information can be obtained from the Secretariat, Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, Faculty of Theology, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, St. Michielsstraat 2, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium. Those who would like to present a short paper during the colloquium should write to the president of the colloquium, at the above address, with their suggestion.

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
Annus academicus 1987-1988. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 296, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	12	259	21	292
Fac. Orientalistica	—	2	2	4
Universi	12	261	23	296
Nationes	59	Alumni		296
Dioceses	149	Alumni		159
Inst. Religiosorum	48	Alumni		110
Inst. Religiosarum	12	Alumnae		12
Ex statu laicali	15	Alumnae		9
		Alumni		6

Laureae

Laurea in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

IM, D. Joseph Seung-phill (01.XII.1987). *Die 'Unschuldserklärungen' in den Psalmen* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: H. SIMIAN-YOFRE.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

BRETÓN, Santiago, *Vocación y misión: Formulario profético* (Analecta Biblica 111). Roma 1987.

DOZZI, Dino, O.F.M. Cap. "*Haec est vita evangelii Jesu Christi*". *Il Vangelo come vita nella «Regola non bollata» di Francesco d'Assisi* (extractum). Roma 1987.

PRIOTTO, Michelangelo, *La prima Pasqua in Sap 18,5-25*. Rilettura e attualizzazione (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 15). Roma 1987.

VALENTINI, Alberto, *Il Magnificat*. Ricerche di struttura letteraria (extractum). Roma 1987.

ZURRO, Eduardo, *Procedimientos iterativos en la poesía ugarítica y hebrea* (Biblica et Orientalia 43). Roma 1987.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Omnes libri ad Directionem missi quodam modo cum rebus biblicis connexi in hoc elencho notantur. Praeterea mandantur redactori *Elenchi bibliographici biblici* et in eodem *Elencho bibliographico* notantur prout redactori bonum videtur.

Eo autem quod hi libri in *Biblica* recipiuntur, nullum de iis exprimitur iudicium.

Recensiones de libris aut fient aut non fient, prout Moderatori recensione opportuno videbitur.

Libri ad Directionem missi, quos Directio periodici non directe recensione gratia expetiverit, numquam remittuntur, etsi de eis recensio non fit.

Libri mittantur ad «Directio *Biblica*, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia».

Vetus Testamentum

Barret, Lois, *The Way God Fights*. War and Peace in the Old Testament (Peace And Justice Series 1). Scottdale, PA – Kitchener, Ont., Herald Press, 1987. 78 p. 19,2 × 13. US \$4.95.

Beauchamp, Paul, *Parler d'Écritures saintes*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1987. 118 p. 20 × 13,8. FF 75.

Cazelles, H., *Autour de l'Exode* (Sources Bibliques). Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs, 1987. 438 p. 23 × 15,5. FF 542.

Cox, Claude E. (ed.), *LXX. VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 23). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1987. xxiii-464 p. 21,5 × 14. US \$14.95.

Croft, Steven J. L., *The Identity of the Individual in the Psalms* (JSOT Supplement Series 44). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987. 218 p. 21,9 × 13,9. US \$15.95.

Eckardt, Walter, *Computergestützte Analyse althebräischer Texte*. Algorithmische Erkennung der Morphologie (ATS 29). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 1987. xi-135 p. 21 × 14,7. DM 24,—.

Friedman, R. E. – **Williamson, H. G. M.** (eds.), *The Future of Biblical Studies*. The Hebrew Scriptures (SBL Semeia Studies). Decatur, GA, Scholars Press, 1987. ix-207 p. 21,5 × 14. US \$13.95.

Isaksson, Bo, *Studies in the Language of Qoheleth*. With Special Emphasis on the Verbal System (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Studia Semitica

Upsaliensia 10). Uppsala - Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1987. 232 p. 24,3 × 17. SEK 172.

Miller, P. D. - Hanson, P. - McBride, S. D. (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion. Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1987. xxv-672 p. 23,5 × 15,5.

Renaud, B., *Michée - Sophonie - Nahum* (Sources Bibliques). Paris, J. Gabalda et C^e Editeurs, 1987. 329 p. 23 × 15,5. FF 375.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament (Hrsg. G. Johannes **Botterweck**, H. **Ringgren** und H.-J. **Fabry**). Band VI, Lieferung 1/2. Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln - Mainz, Verlag W. Kolhammer, 1987. xvii-xxxL-Sp. 1-224. 25,5 × 17,7. DM 74,—.

van der Toorn, Karel, *Van haar Wieg tot Haar Graf*. De rol van de godsdienst in het leven van de Israëlitische en de Babylonische vrouw. Baarn, Ten Have, 1987. 152 p. 20,5 × 12,1.

Wehrle, Jozef, *Prophetie und Textanalyse*. Die Komposition Obadja 1-21 interpretiert auf der Basis textlinguistischer und semiotischer Konzeptionen (ATS 28). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 1987. xiii-408 p. 21 × 14,7. DM 48,—.

Zurro, Eduardo, *Procedimientos iterativos en la poesía ugarítica y hebrea* (Biblica et Orientalia 43). Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1987. xv-396 p. 24 × 16,5.

Novum Testamentum

Aejmelaeus, Lars, *Streit und Versöhnung*. Das Problem der Zusammensetzung des 2. Korintherbriefes (Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja 46) Helsinki, 1987. 343 p. 21 × 14,8.

Burge, Gary M., *The Anointed Community*. The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition. Grand Rapids MI, Eerdmans, 1987. xviii-269 p. 22,5 × 15,3.

Deusch, Celia, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*. Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30 (JSOT Supplement Series 18). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Duplacy, Jean, *Études de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium LXXXVIII). Leuven, University Press - Uitgeverij Peeters, 1987. xxvii-431 p. 24,3 × 16. FB 1.800.

Fee, Gordon D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1987. xxiv-880 p. 22,2 × 14,2.

Goldsworthy, Graeme, *Gospel and Wisdom*. Israel's Wisdom Literature in the Christian Life. Exeter, Devon, The Paternoster Press, 1987. 202 p. 21 × 14. UK £4.95.

Kirchschläger, Walter, *Ehe und Ehescheidung im Neuen Testament. Überlegungen und Anfragen zur Praxis der Kirche*. Wien – München, Herold Verlag, 1987. 112 S. 12,7 × 20,8.

Kreitzer, Joseph L., *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSOT Supplement Series 19). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987. 293 p. 21,4 × 13,8. US \$19.50.

Kruse, Colin G., *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. An Introduction and Commentary* (The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries). Leicester, England – Grand Rapids, MI, Inter-Varsity Press – Eerdmans, 1987. 224 p. 19,3 × 13,3. UK £4.25.

de La Potterie, Ignace *Die Passion nach Johannes*. Der Text und sein Geist (Kriterien 81). Trier, Johannes Verlag Einsiedeln, 1987. 155 p. 19 × 11,5.

Metzger, Marcel, *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, Tome III, Livres VII et VIII (Sources Chrétiennes 336). Paris, Le Cerf, 1987. 368 p. 19 × 12,5. FF 324.

Orchard, B. – Riley, H., *The Order of the Synoptics. Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* Leuven – Macon, Peeters – Mercer University Press, 1987. xiv-279 p. 23,5 × 16.

Pokorný, Petr, *The Genesis of Christology. Foundations for a Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Marcus Lefébure. Edinburgh, T & T Clark Ltd., 1987. xv-266 p. 22,3 × 14,2. UK £14.95.

Quesnel, Michel, *L'histoire des Évangiles* (BREF). Paris, Le Cerf – Fides, 1987. 123 p. 18,5 × 10,5. FF 40.

Schmidt, Thomas E., *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels* (JSOT Supplement Series 15). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Selvidge, Marla J., *Daughters of Jerusalem. "Daughters of Jerusalem do not weep for me". Luke 23:28*. Scottdale PA – Kitchener, Ont., Herald Press, 1987. 172 p. 19,3 × 13,3. US \$9.95.

Zevini, Giorgio, *Commenti spirituali del Nuovo Testamento*. Vangelo secondo Giovanni. Volume secondo. Roma, Città Nuova Editrice, 1987. 331 p. 20,1 × 13,3. Lit. 20.000.

Varia

AA.VV., *Alexandrina. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert* (Patrimoines). Paris, Le Cerf, 1987. xviii-436 p. 23,5 × 14,4. FF 275.

Al-Assiouty, S. A., *Jésus le non-Juif*. Culte d'Isis Précurseur du Christianisme. Classes Sociales à Rome et en Arabie (Recherches comparées sur le Christianisme Primitif et l'Islâm Premier II). Paris, Letouzey & Ané, 1987. 176 p. 21 × 15. FF 88.

Carson, D. A. (ed.), *The Church in the Bible and the World*. An International Study. Exeter – Grand Rapids, The Paternoster Press – Baker Book House, 1987. 21,5 × 14. UK £12.50.

Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Bible. Publié sous la direction du Centre: Informatique et Bible Abbaye de Maredsous. Turnhout, Brepols, 1987. 1363 p. 24 × 17.

Evans, Craig A. – Stinespring, W. F., *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis*. Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee (Homage Series 10). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1987. xxii-281 p. 23,6 × 15,7.

Gryson, R. – Bogaert, P.-M., *Recherches sur l'histoire de la Bible Latine*. (Cahiers de la Revue Théologique de Louvain 19). Louvain-la-Neuve, Publications de la Faculté de Théologie, 1987. 153 p. 24 × 16. FB 750.

Hager, Fritz-Peter, *Gott und das Böse im antiken Platonismus* (Elementa Band XLIII). Würzburg – Amsterdam, Königshausen und Neumann, 1987. 165 p. 22 × 15.

McFague, Sallie, *Models of God*. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1987. xv-224 p. 21,5 × 14.

Piret, Pierre, *L'Écriture et l'Esprit*. Une étude théologique sur l'exégèse et les philosophies (I E T 7). Bruxelles, Editions de l'Institut d'Etudes Théologiques, 1987. 302 p. 22 × 14.

Spanner, D. C., *Biblical Creation and the Theory of Evolution*. Exeter, The Paternoster Press, 1987. 191 p. 21,6 × 14. UK £6.95.

Sussmann, A. – Greenberg, R. (eds.), *Excavations and Surveys in Israel 1986*, Volume 5. Jerusalem, Israel Museum, 1986. vii-127 p. 27,4 × 21,7.

Weingreen, J., *Hébreu biblique. Méthode élémentaire*. (Sessions de Langues Bibliques 13 bis). Paris, Beauchesne, 1987. 41 exercices. 24 × 16. FF 50.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA